



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<https://archive.org/details/viewpoint5351unse>

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 5, No. 3

November 10, 1967

REFLECTIONS BY A WORRIED SENIOR.....	Damon Hickey
ONE LONE LIGHT.....	Gary Burdge
A "RED HERRING" OR IN DEFENSE OF THE CALENDAR OF THE CHURCH YEAR.....	David T. Tomlinson
THE LIFE WITHOUT.....	W. Joseph Preston

The next number of Viewpoint will be devoted to the war in Viet Nam. We hope to receive articles representing a wide spectrum of Seminary opinion on this critical and complex issue.

THE EDITORS

Howard Happ	Andrew Woods	Theodore Atkinson	William LeMosy
Joseph Preston	Carol Moseley	George Dosier	John Mulholland

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Monday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

REFLECTIONS BY A WORRIED SENIOR

Damon Hickey

During my junior year here, I toured with the choir. We were, as I am sure Dr. Jones will testify, a wild bunch. As I think of that group, I remember a spirit of iconoclasm and rather boyish enthusiasm. Most of us, despite our individual hang-ups, sensed that we had three years still ahead of us before the "world" closed in, so we were pretty free and exuberant. We slashed the institutional church or staunchly defended it in principle. We cared little for church decorum or for Dr. Jones's exasperated admonitions to be serious.

Now in my senior year, as I have talked with my classmates and former choir fellows, I have sensed a certain tiredness, apprehensiveness, and lostness even in our most animated conversations. We speak with more measured, "mature" phrases about the church and her future, as if we were afraid to say rash, stupid things. Many of us do not know what we want to do next year, let alone in ten years. In less than nine months, we have to find jobs or graduate schools. We seem afraid to admit, although most of us know, that we have not attained our senior "stature." Our questions have improved a little in three years. Many of us have been through some form of therapy, so we have just a little more self-understanding. But few of my friends are really committed to being pastors any more than they were as juniors--maybe less.

At the end of our junior-year summer choir tour, I asked Dr. Jones if he had noticed any significant changes in thirty-two years of choir talks by students. He said, "Yes, the fellows don't seem to like to talk about commitment any more. I don't know what it is. Maybe they think that will help them get close to the young people, or maybe they're afraid that somebody will think they're being sentimental." Undoubtedly he was right. But I suspect that we were also reflecting our own ambivalence. As Dr. Baker pointed out at the outset of this year, most of us are simultaneously committed and uncommitted. We share acutely in our culture's dilemma, for we are "sacred" and "secular" men, to a degree unshared by the culture as a whole.

Once upon a time, the story goes, men came to seminary firm in the faith and firm in their call to the ministry. They fully expected to mature in that faith, but they had been grasped by the Gospel, and they knew who they were and where they were going. That is partly just a story, a myth, as it were. But theological education has been built on the myth that uncommitment is the exception, not the rule, for theological students. Today we know that commitment is a function of where one stands in a process of life-long conflict and maturation. We find it hard to accept the posture of all-out commitment, even though we long for it.

It seems, though, that the difference between the myth and the reality has not been realized in our education. It is ironic that theological education, which is genuinely struggling to relate itself to our secularized culture, still presupposes an "old-fashioned," single-minded commitment on the part of theological students. It is assumed that most of us come here to be educated to be ministers to local congregations. Once that assumption is made, it is an easy step to an

educational system that is designed to help us acquire the theological perspective and the tools for our ministry. Our commitment is presupposed. Our education is focused, not on us, but on "the job." So we wind up feeling guilty because we are not as committed as we were supposed to be. We try to convince ourselves that we really are committed and that our education has really met our needs.

The job-centered approach provides us with much that is good and helpful, but in the last analysis, it leaves our greatest needs unmet. Our seminary, for example, provides us with a plethora of administrative persons to help us with a variety of educational and vocational problems (if one can find a time when these persons are available), but it does not employ a single trained counselor whose sole responsibility is helping students with their personal hang-ups. This microcosm of the seminary is an accurate reflection of its total approach to theological education. It is job-centered, not person-centered.

I suspect that this article, with its person-centered emphasis, may be interpreted by some as an appeal for a return to a form of individualism that is no longer appropriate. It is not. It is an appeal for an honest and undogmatic reappraisal of the theological student, vintage 1967-68. Most of us, whether we know it or not, came here to learn who we are, and specifically, who we are in relation to the Christian faith. Most of us still do not know. By our presence here, we are asking for help. I am asking that our cry for help, not our commitment, become the presupposition for our education. I am asking that our education focus first on us and our search for ourselves, and then on "the job." We go to minister to lost sheep, but unless we find ourselves first, we shall continue to be lost pastors.

* * * * *

ONE LONE LIGHT

Gary Burdge

One lone light hung from ceiling bare
 Emphasizing my loneliness as I stare
 Looking up from the coldness of my bed
 I wonder, am I really all alone or does someone care?

I move from bed to chair to unfix my gaze
 At that dreary light and ceiling bare
 And drift into the quietness of long moments
 Staring at my image in the glass....
 Is that my only friend?
 Where are those that love me?
 Is there even one who cares?

I leave the chair to window walk
 And raise the shade to see
 And see as hopes....drop....down
 Only blackness staring back at me
 My throat is tight and toward the room I turn

And brush the dampness from my eye
 And ask myself aloud this time....
 Who cares for me?

I sink from sill to bed
 And shield from that damned light my head
 The bareness of that ceiling's there
 And I feel again the coldness of my bed.

* * * * *

A "RED HERRING"
OR
IN DEFENSE OF THE CALENDAR OF THE CHURCH YEAR

This article is occasioned by the negative comments of Mr. Howard Happ aimed at the Church Year Calendar of the United Presbyterian Church, which appeared in the last issue of Viewpoint. Rather than answer Mr. Happ's attacks one by one I would like to present what, I hope, is a positive side of the work being done in this liturgical area. To do so I draw on material which has been published both by Dr. Donald MacLeod in his book Presbyterian Worship, Its Meaning and Method and by Professor J.-J. Von Allmen in his book Worship: Its Theology and Practice. These ideas are further supported by declaratory statements from the Joint Committee on Worship, which has been responsible for the preparation of a new book of common worship for our denomination.

The General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church has commissioned the Joint Committee on Worship to bring up to date the book of common worship. The major portion of their work is contained now in the Book of Common Worship: Provisional Services. This publication contains not only the service for the Lord's Day but such things as the Sacrament of Baptism, the Funeral Service, the Marriage Service, etc. Also contained in this book is a lectionary for the Christian Year giving scripture readings for each of the Sundays throughout a twelve month period. It is out of this lectionary that the calendar for the church year grows. Seen in this light, the calendar becomes an integral part of an entire worship and liturgical system. It is not, as Mr. Happ suggested, "another attempt" of a committee to foist something upon the unsuspecting congregations of our churches. Rather it is another segment in what will hopefully be a well integrated, theologically motivated, liturgical system.

With this as background we can turn our attention to the specific matter at hand, namely the calendar of the Christian Year. The rationale for this particular calendar is the same as for liturgical calendars in any of the other denominations. That is, it is based on our firm belief in the Trinity. The church year (as reflected in the calendar) is clearly trinitarian in nature. It gives the church opportunity during a certain season of the year to place its focus upon each element of the Trinity. In other church calendars now in use there was opportunity to celebrate the birth, life, and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the second person of the trinity. However, God the Father, and God the Holy Spirit did not, in common parlance, receive "equal time." Although they were surely a part of the worship pattern of the long season of Trinity, there was no set pattern for the

celebration of their unique contributions to the Trinity. I believe the committee on worship in setting up the seasons of the year as God the Father, God the Son and, God the Holy Spirit has attempted to show in dramatic fashion the entire creation-redemption history. This can be seen not only by placing emphasis upon all the figures of the Trinity but by the individual themes which are suggested in each of those seasons. For instance: in the season of God the Son we have Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Easter, and Ascension Day. This of course does not vary greatly from the pattern in any other church. It is when we come to the other categories namely, God the Holy Spirit and God the Father, that real differentiation and meaning are given. In the season of God the Holy Spirit, for instance, it is suggested that the worshiper be directed to God as he speaks through the prophets through his church; and through such things as the church in mission, the forgiveness of sin, and the life everlasting. The emphasis here being placed not only on what has happened but what is happening. Likewise in the season of God the Father the worshiped is enjoined to direct his attention to the natural world around him, mankind itself, God's covenant with man, his providence, etc. Therefore, in setting up this scheme, the committee has attempted to present dramatically the Trinity in its entirety and the whole movement of a trinitarian God as he deals with mortal man.

Furthermore, it would seem that the order proposed by the Joint Committee on Worship is realistic in its approach and outlook. Admittedly it is set up around what we might term "modern" worship patterns. Whether or not we approve or what happens during particular seasons of the year, we are forced to live in normal congregations with these facts. It is a foregone conclusion that many of our members will be travelling or for other reasons away from their local congregation for the summer. For the same reason our church attendance and our congregational unity will be revitalized in the fall of each year. We can either choose to ignore these facts as they are or we can seek to use them as we develop a theology and a liturgical pattern for our churches. It is precisely the latter that is suggested by the Calendar of the Church Year currently under discussion. The fall of each year begins with the season of God the Father. This season leads directly into that of God the Son with Advent and Christmas. Finally, after Pentecost (with the celebration of Christ's sending of the Holy Spirit) we embark upon the season of the Holy Spirit and continue in it until the end of the summer. In worship, as in other areas of church life and programming we need to recognize patterns and practices of the modern churchman.

Contrary to the opinion of Mr. Happ this attempt on the part of the Joint Committee of Worship to provide us with a logical Calendar of the Church Year puts us in much better position for ecumenical conversation. At least our church and our denomination freely admit that there is such a thing as a church year! And furthermore, they go beyond this to present what is hopefully a theologically centered rationale for same. Mr. Happ has said that "the more Catholic Church Year is rather the product of accident than of deliberate theological reflection." Hopefully, we need not say this about our own. The basic point is this: realizing the importance of a pattern of worship which follows the great festivals of the Christian Church we are now in a better position to talk with our more liturgically oriented brethren.

In conclusion, Mr. Happ has accused the Presbyterian Church in its presentation of a Church Calendar of being dishonest, anti-ecumenical, and theologically weak. Instead I feel that there is little dishonesty, a basis for continued ecumenical

conversation, and at least the attempt at theological validity as we celebrate in worship the entirety of the Christian Gospel.

* * * * *

THE LIFE WITHOUT...

This is the Life without...

It is one which is free, in the sense
that it is unlimited:

Unlimited by the boxes which you have
created, and which you have insisted
on using;

Unlimited by the artificial rules which
you have written and tried to enforce;

Unlimited by the superficial ethics which
you have tried to make genuine.

This is the Life without...

It is one which is open, in the sense
that it is able to accept:

Accept what lies beyond the categories
of your boxes;

Accept the rules which are created by
the reality in which man exists;

Accept the deeply-felt reasons governing
the behavior of men which reflect what
are, not what they think should be.

This is the life without

god,

And it is mine,

* * * * *

CONTRIBUTORS

Damon Hickey is a Senior B.D. Candidate from Houston, Texas, with an A.B. Degree from Rice University.

Gary Burdge is a Middler from Spokane, Washington. He is a graduate of Whitworth College, where he majored in psychology.

David T. Tomlinson received his B.D. Degree from Princeton Seminary, has supervised the Urban Church program for the Field Education Office, and is presently Admissions Officer for the Seminary.

Joe Preston, one of the Viewpoint editors, is from Clarion, Pennsylvania. He graduated from Clarion State College, with a major in history.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 5, No. 4

December 1, 1967

VIETNAM ISSUE 1967

STATEMENT.....	Richard L. Killmer
STATEMENT.....	Dr. M. Richard Shaul
ASIAN RUSTIC.....	Dan Pure
TO CRITIC AND PROTESTER: <u>QUO VADIS ET QUO ANIMO?</u>	Charles A. Herrick
PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT IN DRAFT RESISTANCE - A STATEMENT.....	Larry E. Trettin
TO THE EDITORS OF VIEWPOINT.....	Dr. Charles C. West
TO THE DISSENTER.....	Terry Newberry
CHANGING TIMES.....	Jack D. Layendecker

THE EDITORS

Howard Happ	Andrew Woods	Theodore Atkinson	William LeMosy
Joseph Preston	Carol Moseley	George Dosier	John Mulholland

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Monday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

STATEMENT

Richard L. Killmer

In 1954, Ngo Dinh Diem with strong support from the United States was appointed Prime Minister and a year later became President of South Vietnam. In the first three years of his rule he committed three acts which led to a revolution. First, Vietnamese villages have historically been independent, autonomous entities which have elected their own officials and solved their own problems. Diem removed the elected leaders in the villages and put in his own men. Second, the Viet Minh, during the war with the French, had given land belonging to absentee landlords to the peasants whose families had worked the land. Diem returned the land to the landlords and demanded back rent from the peasants which was collected by his secret police. Third, Diem refused to hold the elections promised by the Geneva Accords. He even refused to talk to Hanoi to make arrangements for their execution.

About 1957, certain Vietnamese of various political philosophies banded together to overthrow the oppressive Diem regime. The appointed village chiefs were murdered systematically and other acts of violence against the government occurred. Hanoi did not recognize, help, or advise the movement, for at this time they still hoped for the elections promised in Geneva. The arms used by these rebels, who called themselves the National Liberation Front, were captured from government sources, i.e. they were American arms. In 1960, Hanoi finally recognized the N.L.F. and arranged to help them with arms and North Vietnamese volunteers (no North Vietnamese regular troops were sent to the south until after the U.S. bombing and troop increase occurred).

The United States considered Diem and his successors friends, and the National Liberation Front enemies. Why? The reason given by the Administration was and is that the N.L.F. and Hanoi are communists. What is meant by that statement is not that these two forces have chosen a particular economic and political system, but that somehow they are involved in a communist monolithic conspiracy that plans to conquer the whole world.

George Kennan, the former ambassador to Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union and currently professor at the Woodrow Wilson School and the Institute of Advanced Studies, said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "...to speak of them (the Communists) as though they represented a single disciplined political force operating under the conspiratorial control of some single political will, ...is to fly in the face of an overwhelming body of evidence, to move intellectually into the realm of patent absurdity, to deny by implication the relevance of external evidence to the considerations and decisions of foreign affairs." Keep in mind the fact that Ho and his compatriots have been fighting foreign forces all their lives and they have no intention of being ruled by the Soviet Union, by China (their traditional enemy), or by some mystical monolithic conspiracy.

One of the unspoken presuppositions of our policy in Vietnam is the belief that the Vietnamese are really not capable of handling their situation nor of making decisions about their own destiny, and therefore need our political "adeptness" and our military technology. Holding these paternalistic beliefs, we therefore choose to ignore Vietnamese history, but choose instead to perpetuate outmoded myths of international conspiracy and falling dominoes.

Reinhold Niebuhr in The Nature and Destiny of Man describes the tendency of nations to deify their values and their power. "The pride of nations consists in the tendency to make unconditional claims for their conditional values." He adds that prophetic religion has always been in conflict with this national self-deification. That the United States considers herself involved in a God-given and a God-blessed task in Vietnam cannot be denied. The prophetic role must be filled.

* * * * *

STATEMENT

Dr. M. Richard Shaull

Our attitude toward U. S. involvement in Vietnam and our decisions as to what to do about it will depend, to no small degree, upon our reading of the present international situation; i.e., our understanding of what is happening especially in the underdeveloped world, and what the nature of the present international struggle is. The fact that we are Christians provides us with no special answers, no specifically Christian view of the international scene. But a vital faith should do two things: create in us a very real sensitivity to the hopes and longings of the peoples of the world, to what is now happening to them and to what might be involved in their struggle for a better future; and give us the freedom to look critically at what our own government is doing, because we believe in a God who stands in judgment on our way of life and who is actively transforming our given order in the direction of His Kingdom.

At the present time, the policy of our government seems to be based on two assumptions:

1. That the basic issue in international affairs is the struggle between our western free world and totalitarian Communism;
2. That our nation, as the defender of the free world and the representative of democratic society, has the right and responsibility to use its power in order to preserve that way of life in the Third World.

Our problem lies in the fact that events have moved far beyond this point in recent years. Here I can only hint at some of the major changes that have taken place:

1. The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have come to see that their situation is similar to that of the Negro in the U.S.A. Their existence has been largely by economic, cultural and political forces from outside which have made it impossible for them to have an authentic self-identity as a people, decide how their national life should be organized, or determine their own destiny. Thus the new fact in the situation is nationalism, which symbolizes the struggle, on the part of these nations, to achieve a new self identity and to develop their own economic and political structures in relative independence of western power.

2. From this vantage point, the U.S.A. is not seen as the great hope for the development of a new society, but rather - along with Russia- as the major obstacle to the achievement of what the new nations most desperately want at the present time. Primarily as a result of our action in Vietnam, we now represent, for many peoples, the greater danger.

3. For these nations, the decisive question is not whether they will choose our system or Communism. Authentic national development must mean the development of structures most adequate to concrete situations, structures which will be quite different from ours,

especially at the end of the colonial era. Many of the new leaders in these nations are interested in Marxism, not as a total world view or an international power, but as one instrument, among others, for understanding their situation and building a new society. Even those leaders who use Marxism in this way and rely on Communist support from outside are not in the least interested in exchanging one form of external domination for another.

Within this perspective, I would propose that we should work for the following goals:

A gradual change in the nature of our relationships with the developing nations. Our national self-interest today should lead us to encourage authentic national development rather than maintain the present structures of colonial domination or assume that our task is to make the world safe for U.S. business investment.

The maintenance of a balance of power with Russia and the Communist world in general which would favor the increasing independence of the developing nations. If we are concerned about the problem of Communist power in Asia, Africa and Latin America, perhaps we should do everything possible to strengthen nationalist government there, even those that are in some degree Marxist.

Work for getting the U.S. out of Vietnam as quickly as possible. The longer we are there, the more alienated we become from those leaders and movements in the Third World that will be able to contribute most to the development of their countries.

Basically, the task we face is nothing less than discovering how to engage in a long-term struggle to bring about the type of fundamental changes in our society that will open the way toward more creative relationships with the poor nations. If the Vietnam struggle helps us to move toward greater insight and commitment at this point, the immense amount of suffering it is causing will not be entirely in vain.

* * * * *

ASIAN RUSTIC

Dan Pure

[SAIGON, Sept. 26 (UPI).-]
New fighting is expected on
four scattered fronts that
could signal the beginning of
new offensives by Communist
troops.]

Unseen militant forms
cluster up
to muffled horn and tympani
deep inside their stunted
minds.
Within each man

cacophonous forces
are mounting
for the shattering outburst.

Somewhere in Vietnam
cricket chattering
and lonely
antiphonal ty ba chords
color
departing evening
with enclosing
pink
warmth.
But opals
on blades of grass
reflect
muted brass and snare.
Birds glide from the clear night sky
to settle upon phosphorescent boughs
faithfully awaiting the nocturnal epiphany
when suddenly
In the clearing ahead,
a thousand lutes can be heard
playing with resignation,
churning evocations of forgotten pastorals--
the sad, reminding music
that might have been lost
had not this wonderful womanly

Napalm destroys a hundred ways
and even spiders abandon their webs
to watch these firework displays.
But maybe one or the other will take one last look
at a reluctant tree
and lunge for -- what else? --
Uncle Sam
Uncle Ho
and Eternity....

* * * * *

TO CRITIC AND PROTESTER: QUO VADIS ET QUO ANIMO?*

Charles A. Herrick

My aim in this article is neither to act as an apologist for the Johnson Administration's policy in Vietnam nor to join its critics. What I am interested in, rather, is to pursue certain questions concerning the war and the nature of opposition to it that either are infrequently asked or whose answers are inadequately pursued to their logical conclusions. I would hope that some rational thinking could be brought to bear on what seems to be an increasingly emotional attitude on the part of those who demand that we get out of involvement in Southeast Asia at any price.

*"Where are you going and with what spirit (or intention)?" - ed.

I

This -- the "price" -- is the primary problem which must be pursued, and it seems that this immediately involves a consideration of the legitimacy of the "domino theory" of Communist expansion. Even in the peace of my study I can hear the cry go up that this "theory" is nothing more than a scare tactic conjured up by those extremists who would immediately destroy Communism throughout the world -- at any price. But let us look at what the consequences of this theory would be if it were true, always looking forward to the further basic question, What would have to take place to convince those who scoff at the possibility of a Communist takeover in Asia that they are wrong? We will return to this point later; first it must be pointed out that those who deny the domino theory do so either because at no time has it ever been legitimate; i.e., the nature of Communism is such that it never has advocated overthrow of non-Communist governments, or that it is not legitimate today because China, obviously the moving force in Asian Communism, has too many internal problems to do any more than cheer on the internal guerilla forces of a given Asian country. The first position would be hard to maintain if we are to believe what the Communists themselves say; the second is, more probably than not, true, but carries with it the implication that if and when China solves these problems it will again take up its old role as a fomentor of revolution in the name of international Communism.

Thus the question becomes one of whether Communism should be stopped at all. Those who support our presence in Vietnam obviously say that it should, and that (to quote Omar Bradley) "this is a war at the right place, at the right time, and with the right enemy." Those who are opposed to our policy seem to have three alternative positions to stand on. A. Communism is a system which does not have my fundamental support; nevertheless, this is not the "right war at the right time." B. Communism is a system which does not have my fundamental support, but I would rather see it prevail in Asia, even throughout the world, than ever to to war over it. C. I see certain advantages to Communism, and perhaps would even prefer it to living under any other government, including (or perhaps especially!) that of the United States; in any event, I refuse to fight against it now or at any other time.

Position A I take to be that of the overwhelming number of Americans who are opposed to our present involvement, including the Congressional opponents. Position B is, I maintain, qualitatively different from either A or C. It is that of the absolute pacifist who presumably, by his presence in America, prefers this society to a Communist one, just as he preferred it to that of, for example, Nazi Germany, but who nevertheless would refuse to fight in defense of it on the grounds of absolute moral principles. This, the position of the late Rev. A. J. Muste, is a wholly admirable one, and, as would probably be readily admitted by all, is the only position which is entirely self-consistent. It is because I respect anyone who persistently and consistently holds to pacifism that I would like to clarify the logical alternatives within a pacifist position in order to compare them with those who like to see themselves as pacifists, but who, in fact, are opposed to this war in Vietnam on political, not primarily moral grounds.

The person who faithfully holds to position B may 1) work for the election of a pacifist government in the United States, 2) renounce his citizenship and associate himself with a country (perhaps a desert island?) which just as consistently as any individual lives by the pacifist principle, or 3) renounce his citizenship and associate himself with a country whose involvement in some future war (whether "offensive" or "defensive," it could make absolutely no difference) will force him to move on once again. As more than one person has noted, this will be the dilemma of those U.S. draft-dodgers now in Canada, should that

country ever become involved in war; they may yet get the opportunity to show how absolute their pacifism is. Possibility 4) for the pacifist is to declare his position openly within the society at war in any and all ways possible: burning his draft card, refusing to pay taxes in any form, etc. This fourth alternative, of course, involves taking the consequences of his actions (probable jail sentence), which means being out of political circulation as surely as do decisions 2) and 3).

In light of our present Vietnam situation (and still thinking in terms of the basic question of the legitimacy or illegitimacy of the "domino theory") it is position C above which I find most interesting. This is the one which says, basically, "I am not strongly enough opposed to Communism that I would fight it now or at any time." Presumably we have here the person whose moral integrity takes precedence over any political or national interest--an admirable position, as we saw in the case of the pacifist. But is this person a pacifist? In order to tell, substitute "Fascism" for "Communism" in the second sentence of this paragraph. Now does the pacifist principle still reign over any political consideration? As we all know, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, for one, ultimately had to answer no. Rather it seems that a number of opponents to the war would do more truth to their position (and more justice to the true pacifist's) if they would admit their principle is political. They easily identify a threat from the "right", and deny even the possibility of a comparable threat from the "left." For it must be remembered that positions A and C deny the legitimacy of the domino theory. (The pacifist, in effect, is simply not interested.)

Now suppose, for the sake of argument, that in future years the "domino theory" shows itself to be valid after all, apart from what the outcome in Vietnam may be. It would then seem that a point would be reached where those in group A above, which I suggested includes Fulbright, et. al. -- that is those who fundamentally oppose Communism but who believe we are wrong to be in Vietnam now-- would have to say "Here we stand! We were brainwashed"(they might say)"into believing that Communism would not expand beyond its influence in 1967 (or 1960, or 1950?). We now recognize that it is a force to be reckoned with after all, for the sake of the few free countries left in Asia, and even for the sake of our own security. Therefore, although we do not want to fight, we must." Now, then, what is qualitatively different in this attitude from that of those who say the exact same thing in November, 1967?

Position B, that of the absolute pacifist, has already been made clear. He may or may not believe in the validity of the domino theory, but it is of no consequences; his self-consistent principle will not allow him to condone opposition to any wave of conquest. He will already have removed himself from the necessity of having the quantitative decisions of whom to resist and when by his qualitative one. He will, that is, have chosen to remove himself effectively from the society which is involved in making quantitative decisions concerning war.

To elaborate, then, on the possibilities open to him who is in position C when faced with the surprising fact that the domino theory seems to be proven correct after all: first, he may, in light of the situation, repent of ever having said that he would never fight against Communism. So doing, he would then join the ranks of group A as described in the preceding paragraph. Second, he can continue to deny, no matter how many countries are now Communist which were not awhile back, that the domino theory is valid. There might, then, despite the usual outcry from many when this is done, be some interesting parallels drawn to Europe in the late 1930's. Third, he may grudgingly admit that the domino theory does seem to be working intself out, but cling all the more defiantly to the fact that, after all, he has always associated himself with "the pacifist movement" (well, since 1945, anyway, and perhaps with the exception of the Arab-Israeli war of 1967),

and no matter what the consequences, still refuse to resist. As a result of his refusal to support the national effort of defending the country, he is, of course, thrown into jail, protesting all the time that history will recognize him as the true patriot for crying, "Peace, peace!" (If we listen more closely we may also hear him saying, first out of one corner of his mouth, and then the other, "Of course I would have defended my country against Hitler! Of course I am a pacifist!")

In discussing groups A and C so far, we have seen that it is conceivable that in some future time, i.e., when the domino theory shows its legitimacy, group A, out of a sincere patriotism will take the place of those who insist that the domino theory is indeed at work now, and that therefore we must take a stand now. And those of group C, at least in the second and third alternatives, have been driven closer and closer to the pacifist (B) although, it must be clear that in order to really be honored as pacifists, they must forever abandon that convenient privilege of specifying just which wars they will support and which they will oppose. Whoever will not denounce all war is still acting out of political, and not moral convictions.

What I am suggesting is that, given our hypothetical situation of Communism closing in on America itself (and not "way over there" in Asia), everyone would be forced into one of these two positions. Whoever is not a pacifist would be faced with the basic decision: the country as we have known it, or the country as the communists would have it.

Is the choice scoffed at as too dramatic? It is not, I believe, if the logical consequences of each position discussed so far have been followed and accepted. We started off, remember, with two basic attitudes toward the domino theory. Either it is true, meaning that Communism is a movement with both the intention and the means to influence non-Communist countries to Communism, or else we are deluded, either through a misreading of what Communism is saying or through being a victim of our own fears, in supposing Communism has any such intention. The Johnson Administration obviously thinks the theory is true today, and that it is unlikely to become less true by denying it, while its opponents reject its validity. The question is: are those who are opposed and yet are not pacifists, i.e., those who say that this is a war at the wrong place, at the wrong time, and with the wrong enemy, able to state any conditions in relation to Communism in which any or all these "wrongs" would be right? How many in this country wanted to have to fight World War II? And yet ultimately the conditions came to exist which made it overwhelmingly evident that we would have to fight.

II

We move on to a consideration of civil disobedience in general. My basic thesis is this: given our democracy, protest which goes beyond the limit of legality ceases to be logical. If a person has chosen to remain in American society, he has affirmed it in some way. That is, he has chosen not to flee to Canada (a pale alternative to American society, but then, it is conveniently close to the folks back home); he has chosen not to flee to the democratic Democratic Republic of Vietnam; he has chosen not to flee to some remote place where life is so free of human problems that democratic government--indeed, any government--is unnecessary. He has decided, that is, not to "drop out" of America. Hindered by no one in his choice of where in the world he will live, he has affirmed by remaining, that there is something in the present structure of society which is worth maintaining in its more or less present form.

We can now raise again the question we asked at the end of section I, but in a slightly different form. The question there was the theoretical one, "What conditions would justify

taking up arms against an expanding Communist movement?" Now we ask: What would the citizen who has freely chosen America consider a threat to this best of all existing societies? An attack on an American embassy? An attack on a ship in the Gulf of Tonkin? An attack on American lives on the high seas ("Remember the Lusitania!")? An attack on an American territory ("Remember Pearl Harbor!")? An attack on the West Coast? One of these, certainly, would demand retaliation from him how is a citizen.

Now, a demonstration, such as the recent one in Washington, is obviously a legitimate response to what one considers the immoral policies of the Administration in power. But he who engages in civil disobedience in his protest to this war must accept the consequences of that opposition which are spelled out in the Constitution and laws of the country. At the Biblical Department meeting the suggestion was made that there may come a time in a democracy when a minority is persecuted by a majority. Now in terms of racial and cultural minorities this is manifestly true. On a political question, such as our presence in Vietnam, however, this is logically absurd. Of course there is no denying that it is possible that opposition to the war is morally superior to supporting it, i.e., that this minority's political basis is in morality. But within the context of a democracy, he must convince those who can conceive of a morally worse situation than fighting this war at this time. Morality in a political contest is always open to interpretation. Only the absolute pacifist can abstract himself from political differences which are more or less morally based. Which is more, which is less - this is precisely the question; and in a democracy, it is ultimately the majority who decides. If the groundswell of opposition to the war indeed comes to constitute a majority, fine; a "peace" candidate will be elected and we will all stand or fall by his policies. But until he who opposes this war elects by due process an administration who agrees with his position, he must live under the Johnson Administration.

After this length discussion we are left with three basic questions, the answers to which might be quite revealing: 1) Are those who want us to get out of Vietnam now willing to answer to history should that action be carried out and not lead to a permanent peace but a still greater war in the future? 2) Leading out of this, once more, for the non-pacifist objector to the war, where, quite specifically, is the point of inescapable conflict between the desire for peace and the desire to maintain one's freely chosen society? And 3) for those who despair of democracy itself and/or America itself, what are their alternative proposals?

* * * * *

PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT IN DRAFT RESISTANCE -- A STATEMENT

Larry E. Trettin

On December 4th the second national "Turn -In" will occur. Under the direction of the nation-wide movement called "Resistance," draft cards will be collected and turned in to the Federal Government. Under the present Selective Service Act any not having possession of their draft card is liable to imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of \$10,000, or both. I have decided to turn my card in.

This movement deserves the special attention of seminary students for they are considered as "Privileged Individuals" by the administrators of the Selective Service System. Unlike the "normal" student who may or may not get a 2-S deferment, the Seminary student is required by law to receive a permanent "vocational" deferment from military service before they even have a "vocation." (Supposedly, of course, they are planning to enter the ordained clergy.) The seminary student is thus set apart from other young men his age by this deferment. Herein is the situation which allowed me to finalize my decision: The 4-D classification allows (even encourages) the student NOT to face the ethical/moral

question of war. Further, it makes it easy for him to never even ask the question of why someone should die while he sits reading his book. In regards to the highly debated Vietnam conflict specifically, the deferment allows him to never even ask what the basis of the conflict is (this has become painfully evident as I have tried to speak to fellow-students). In essence the deferment provides the seminary student the profane "luxury" of saying he has no time to read or think about the conflict (after all, people are only being killed!) because he has papers to write, assignments to prepare for, or field work to which he must go.

This, being central to my decision, it is not the entire picture. With specific reference, again to the Vietnam conflict, the issue of "selective conscientious objection" has been renewed. Presently the Selective Service System, through the members of its local Selective Service Boards, has set itself up as the only one capable to decide the "sincerity" of a man's conscientious objection. To heighten the issue, it has further decided for itself that no man can be "selective" in his conscience. That is, there is no place for a contextual ethic for everyone recognizes that "right" is "right" for all situations and "wrong" likewise. I call this judgmental bias blasphemous. Where was the Church of Christ when the Selective Service Act was recently revised? Or is this "Caesar's business" and, consequently, not ours? I have decided that at least in this case my God will certainly come before my country!

Even broader than these two issues, though, is the question of how one crams a system of conscription into what is asserted by all of us to be a "democratic" nation? Woodrow Wilson said in 1918 that "Peacetime conscription is the root evil of Prussianism." When, in 1948, we adopted the policy, was the same thing said concerning "Americanism?" Again I ask, where was the Church when this policy was developed, strengthened, and, most recently, renewed for another four year period? To point up the seriousness of this system's injustice and inequity, I quote General Hershey:

"Throughout his career as a student, pressure--the threat of loss of deferment--continues. It continues with equal intensity after graduation. His local board requires periodic reports to find out what he is up to. He is impelled to pursue his skill rather than embark on some less important enterprise, and is encouraged to apply his skill in an essential activity of national interest. The loss of deferred status is the consequence for the individual who acquired the skill and either does not use it, or uses it in an unessential activity.

"The psychology of granting wide choice under pressure to take action is the American or indirect way of achieving what is done by direction in countries where choice is not permitted."

And the President's Committee on Selective Service has said:

"The determination of the justness or unjustness of any war can only be made within the context of that war itself. Forcing upon the individual the necessity of making that distinction...would be the practical effect of taking away the Government's obligation of making it for him."

I ask once again, WHERE HAS THE CHURCH BEEN while all this has been and while it continues to go on? And I offer you this answer: THE CHURCH HAS BEEN DEFERRED!!! The Church has given up its right to speak and has chosen to "render to Caesar" what is both Caesar's AND what is God's!

This has, perforce, been sketchy and brief. I welcome the opportunity to speak personally with those of you who will react in one way or another. My hope is that you will act!

TO THE EDITORS OF VIEWPOINT

Dr. Charles C. West

Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, the body which organized the mobilization in Washington last January, is currently circulating a statement for signatures and support on "Conscience and Conscription." I would like to call the attention of the Seminary community to it.

The issue is the failure of the present selective system to provide any way by which the prospective draftee can conscientiously object to service in this war. There is provision for conscientious objection to all war, on the basis of basis "religious belief and training," but this must not include "essentially political, philosophical, or sociological views, nor merely personal code." Those who, having analyzed the human political elements in light of whatever their faith may be, conclude that they cannot in good conscience participate actively in our government's adventure in Vietnam have only one choice: to disobey the law when their number comes up and go to prison.

This, says the statement, is a basic injustice. "It represents a substitution of force for reason, an effort to obtain obedience without assent." It is an injustice that our government shows no signs of being ready to rectify. Therefore, it continues, "for both patriotic and religious reasons we are now forced to the defense of those who wish to resist the encroachment of government upon the sanctity of conscience." The final, and operative paragraphs read as follows:

"The Selective Service Act asserts that anyone "who knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces----shall be liable to imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of ten thousand dollars or both.

"We hereby publicly counsel all who in conscience cannot today serve in the armed forces to refuse such service by non-violent means. We pledge ourselves to aid and abet them in any way we can. This means that if they are now arrested for failing to comply with a law that violates their conscience we too must be arrested, for in the sight of that law we are now as guilty as they.

"When true to their tradition churches and synagogues have always been sanctuaries for conscience. We therefore call upon our fellow clergy and laymen to sign this statement, to set up draft counselling centers, to do everything possible in their communities for these conscientious objectors, and to be prepared to pay whatever price may be exacted to defend the rights of conscience our government refuses to honor. As clergy and laymen we could live neither with ourselves nor with our God if today we did not keep faith with those who refuse to surrender their consciences to the state."

There follow particular implementation proposals and the address of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam: Room 547, 475 Riverside Drive, New York.

I have signed this statement, and would like to invite members of the Seminary community to join me in it. The issues, as I see them are two.

First is the simple right to freedom of conscience with regard to military service. Traditionally this right has been abridged in the face of clear and present danger to the security of the state in times of war. The state has the right of self-defense against those who wish its destruction by the victory of the enemy. But there is no such danger today.

The undeclared war in Vietnam, however much one might defend it in terms of United States interests and commitments, poses no conceivable threat to the existence of this country. The conscientious objectors with whom we are concerned here, are patriots who are opposing our government's actions there out of sincere concern for the best interest and the good name of our country. It is neither wise nor safe for governmental authority in a democracy to imprison or impress its opposition by military means. Certainly the Christian whose conscience is captive to another Lord, can neither allow himself nor others to be so coerced without resistance. On this point those who oppose and those who support our government's action in Vietnam could well agree.

The second issue is opposition to our Vietnam intervention itself. I believe it to be wrong. Its continuation cannot help but bring Divine judgment on this country. The only conceivable way of obedience to God in this situation is to pull back from our present overwhelming use of force, to seek negotiation and the good offices of a reliable outside agency which would allow us to withdraw in peace. This is not basic pacifism. It is not opposition to the existence of the United States Armed Forces, or to the selective service system as a means of providing them with personnel, - though there are many inequities in the system - student deferments and the 4D classification among them - which I believe should be corrected. It is not even objection to a United States presence in Southeast Asia, so far as this is useful to indigenous peoples and their governments as an element in the balance of power that maintains their freedom. It is however a conviction about the will and promise of God, based on political understanding of what is happening in troubled Vietnam, above all what I, vicariously through my government, am doing there. I believe it to be the duty of a Christian today, to oppose our government's policy in the most effective way he can. The negative side of this is that if he is faced with military service which is likely to take him to Vietnam he should avoid it if he can find a constructive deferred or exempt alternative; otherwise he should refuse it. A signature on the above statement and the actions to which it leads, places me alongside the prospective draftee in the risks and the promises of Christian obedience.

There remains a question: what is the most effective way of bringing our government back to reason and morality in Vietnam? I for one do not think that turning in draft cards, renouncing 4D status, or obstructing induction centers, is effective. There is a case against the selective service system as such - it falls unjustly on the poor, it tends to discriminate racially, it favors the scientific and technological enterprise of our society at cost of the cultural and human service vocations (except for the theological student and clergy exemption). But this issue is a different one from opposition to Vietnam. To confuse them only weakens both. Our problem with relation to Vietnam is basically the moral, spiritual, political education of the conscience of the American people, and the construction of a political power alliance that has some chance of forcing President Johnson to take notice. The net result of all the polls is that most of the American people are neither doves nor hawks; they simply do not know how to fly. They are restive and frustrated by the war but do not know which way to turn. They want peace but do not know on what terms. They dislike Johnson's handling of the war but will not oppose his policies. In this situation one of the greatest single forces for change could be the power of the Christian conscience mobilized and informed by ministers and theological students. Here is the positive task. It will lead to risks enough if we take it seriously - first of all in our own congregations and presbyteries. But more important, it is the special kind of work, the unique contribution to the world's reconciliation, which we have been called to do.

* * * * *

TO THE DISSENTER

Terry Newberry

As I sit down to write about Vietnam, I realize that I am about to tackle a much discussed, perhaps overdiscussed problem. It faces every American and every man in the world. No one approves of war or killing for its own sake, and enough has been written about this war to fill an olympic-sized swimming pool. You and I have been bombarded by hawk and dove alike. Unfortunately, the opinions are polarizing, and it now seems that one must be either a hawk or a dove. As we put all those who protest into one slot, we tend to do the same thing with those who see the necessity of this war.

For us to condemn the President for his policy is one thing, but haven't we started to condemn the totality? We are all concerned, and in my opinion the best way to handle it is politically. Recently, I heard an objection to this running something like, "What choice do we have when we go to the polls?" My response to this is that if you feel there is no choice, where were you when the candidates were selected?

It is fine for us to sit in our tower of intellect and take a plunge into the swimming pool, emerging dripping wet with an opinion for the world, but if you are really concerned, use the most effective machinery available to you. When a picket sign is waved, no matter how much coverage it gets on Huntley-Brinkley, it has lost its meaning. No one takes this seriously anymore.

One of the advantages of our political system is that you and I can become parts of it, and through it we can make our voices heard. If the candidates nominated by the two major parties are unacceptable to you, register with one or the other and use your voice and energy in that party's machinery to get someone nominated who will represent your point of view. Too often we sit on the sidelines being negative.

The discussions centering around this problem are valid, and you and I have a right to be heard. If we disagree with what is now the policy, we must be prepared to offer something better, and we should work within the system to bring it about. But all this has been said before too, and I am sure that if we dive around in the swimming pool, we will find it somewhere near the bottom. This approach requires time, effort, study, and real work. Few of us are willing to make this type of sacrifice. It is easier to wave a cardboard sign.

I think that your opinion should be more important to you than that. Use the tools that are available to you to make the government your government; not that of someone else.

* * * * *

CHANGING TIMES

Jack D. Layendecker

"Aye, Johnny-
 there be a time that swords did wrattle,
 But nowadays-
 Nowadays the cannons roar.
 Barbaric hordes 'engaged' to battle,
 But nowadays-
 Refiner man's 'betroted' to war."

CONTRIBUTORS

RICHARD L. KILLMER is a Senior B.D. student from Woodridge, N.J., and a graduate of Franklin and Marshall College. He spent the post year as an intern in the campus ministry at Penn State. As an expression of conscience in objection to the Vietnam War he has recently decided to turn in his draft card.

DR. M. RICHARD SHAULL is Professor of Ecumenics at Princeton Theological Seminary.

DAN PURE, a Junior from Barrington, N.J., is a graduate of Rutgers University.

CHARLES A. HERRICK is a graduate of De Pauw University and received his B.D. from this Seminary, where he is currently pursuing the Th.D. degree.

LARRY E. TRETTIN, a Senior, is a graduate of San Francisco State College.

DR. CHARLES C. WEST is Professor of Applied Christianity at Princeton Theological Seminary.

TERRY NEWBERRY was graduated from Brown University in 1962, after which he served as a commissioned officer in the United States Navy for four years. He comes from Plainfield, N.J., and is presently a Middler.

JACK D. LAYENDECKER, a member of the Junior Class, had worked as a dental technician for 13 years when he decided to enter the ministry. He is a Class of '67 graduate of Franklin and Marshall College. He and Mrs. Layendecker, a registered nurse at the Merwick Unit, Princeton Hospital, are the parents of four sons.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 5, No. 5

December 8, 1967

PATIENT HOPE.....	Dr. Daniel L. Migliore
REVIVAL OF THE COCK FIGHT.....	David D. Cuttino
VIETNAM: CRISIS OF CONSCIENCE.....	Rev. Robert E. Sanders
FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE.....	Student Council
THE OTHER NAZARENE.....	Laird J. Stuart

THE EDITORS

Howard Happ	Andrew Woods	Theodore Atkinson	William LeMosy
Joseph Preston	Carol Moseley	George Dosier	John Mulholland

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Friday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

PATIENT HOPE Romans 8:25

Dr. Daniel L. Migliore

"But if we hope for what we do not see,
we wait for it with patience." -RSV

I suspect that Paul's linking of hope and patience is more embarrassing to us than we like to admit. We are struggling to recover the revolutionary meaning of the gospel for our time. Our attention is increasingly upon Christian hope, which we no longer understand as timid withdrawal from the world, but as creative protest against given reality. To hope is to contradict the present and to advance beyond it toward new possibilities. When we hope, we affirm that the present must give way to the future, that the old must give way to the new. Patience, on the contrary, seems to belong irretrievably to the vocabulary of the Establishment. It is part of the ideological arsenal of the System which generously promises change but always postpones it to the indefinite future. Whereas hope drives toward new beginnings, patience means captive resignation to the way things are.

Judging from our text, Paul would consider this situation in which hope and patience collide head-on perilous to a right understanding of the gospel. If he does not permit hope and patience to break apart, it is because he understands both in relation to the cross. Paul is able to speak of hope and patience together because for him the basis of hope is the crucified and risen Jesus, and the expression of hope is participation in his sufferings. Patient hope for Paul is not cheap consolation. It is hope which has given up the deception of quick and easy solutions in the struggle for the "glorious freedom of the children of God." It is hope stripped of pretensions and illusions, and just for that reason, strong and steadfast hope. To speak of this patient hope is not to undermine the struggle for a new humanity, but to speak of a hope which endures when the going gets tough.

Hope runs out of breath in contemporary heroism and in the despair of contemporary individualism. Both are forms of hopelessness from the standpoint of the hope of the cross. In the manner of the hero of hope, we can launch our all-out attack on the System, determined to introduce a new era of man free from the stranglehold of the past. Whether we succeed or fail, what will keep our hope from cynicism, and what will protect our love from the temptation of brutality? Or in the manner of the inward man of our time, we can resign ourselves to the System, content to gain at least an inward victory over it. But will we still be men when we have betrayed our common humanity? Christian hope travels neither the way of the hero nor the way of the inward man. It travels the way of the cross into all of reality. It lives and loves and suffers there alongside the neighbor, reaching and working for a better world, making the most of every possibility to humanize the life of man.

Now is this a summons to "a little bit of a revolution?" Is it a call to radical change, provided that everything is done decently and in order? Is it a genteel, middle-of-the-road warning to the church to stop flirting with the use of civil disobedience, or even resistance, to achieve things hoped for? I do not think so. My point, however, is that Paul's text raises for us a more basic and a more important question than these. The real problem to which the text is addressed is not how to contain the revolution but how to keep it going. In speaking of patient hope, Paul does not intend to limit the power of hope but to witness to a hope of a peculiar quality and with staying power. The real question is what keeps revolutionary hope alive when the revolution has completed its life-cycle, as each does, and when the former revolutionaries become the new reactionaries.

The Confession of 1967 has the following to say on our theme. "Already God's reign is present as a ferment in the world, stirring hope in men and preparing the world to receive its ultimate judgment and redemption. With an urgency born of this hope the church applies itself to present tasks and strives for a better world. It does not identify limited progress with the Kingdom of God on earth, nor does it despair in the face of disappointment and defeat. In steadfast hope the church looks beyond all partial achievement to the final triumph of God."

When the Confession speaks of the "steadfast hope" which "does not despair in the face of disappointment and defeat," it is interpreting the patient hope of which Paul speaks. Christian hope is hope in the future opened by the crucified Lord. This does not rob hope of its transforming activity in the world but simply identifies its peculiarly Christian quality and the source of its endurance.

* * * * *

REVIVAL OF THE COCK FIGHT

David D. Cuttino

What joy--the letting of the blood!
 Tearing, snarling, striking out
 Giving and receiving searing pain.
 Carefully, with deliberation and study
 We ply the arousal of their emotion
 And the loss of their reason.

Innocuous it shall not be.
 Harmless--never!
 Arm them with the sharp steel blade.
 Let not the talons only speak.
 With intention define the limits
 That there be no escape.
 Prod and cheer that ardor not cool.
 Let there be no rising up
 To see the twisted scene.
 Let them think they serve
 Their own desires,
 That they may not recognize
 The beneficiary of their struggle.

Clarion strains shall not proclaim
 My true intentions.
 Humility and righteous tones
 Instead bespeak charity.
 Security is my aim
 Their dependency my tact.
 Is it not the proper view?
 O sons of Paraoah, O sons of Israel
 Is it not?

VIETNAM: A CRISIS OF CONSCIENCE

A sermon preached by the Reverend Robert E. Sanders
First Presbyterian Church, Utica, New York

Americans are an unhappy people. There is a mood of depression and gloom all over our land. Analysts in several disciplines agree about the presence of this mood amongst us. Several of you have told me privately that you too deeply sense the disquiet that is abroad. We are an unhappy, disturbed people and I believe we are so because the Vietnam War is weighing heavily upon us.

We are living through a crisis of conscience. Will we lose face, or lose our soul? Public opinion polls over the past several months show a decided change in conviction about the conflict in Southeast Asia. They reveal that Americans are increasingly unsure about our presence, our position, and our prosecution of the War in Vietnam. The polls also show that a majority of Americans are apparently growing discontent with our government's policy or escalating this conflict. Not I know that many of you here this morning have very serious reservations about the course we are pursuing. I know, too, that many of you agree with President Johnson's policies. In this all-important issue, there are several positions, and there are several courses of action which earnest Americans are proposing. And we must hear all sides, and above all, we must respect, we must protect the rights of those who hold views with which we disagree. As a minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, I should not have to defend my right to speak about the Vietnam War. It is a moral issue. And the Church must speak to it, and I pray God, do all that it can to end this tragic loss of human life. The Church must continue to speak out, to be heard, before our consciences are totally fossilized, before total numbness sets in.

Now, I am not a pacifist. But if I could bring myself to follow Jesus Christ without any reservations whatsoever, I confess I think he would lead me never to strike back, never to kill, or support what kills. Yet I feel that there have been just wars in history. Several months ago I was a confused about the war in Vietnam as anyone else. But today this is no longer true, and I want to tell you why this is so. I am preaching this sermon because I am a professing Christian, and a concerned citizen of this beloved land of ours. I am preaching this sermon to you because I love America, but I am deeply distressed, profoundly disturbed by what the war is doing to us and among us. I am preaching this sermon, too, because of my conviction that we may be very near a moral collapse in this country. Or, as an eminent psychiatrist put it last week, we are very near a kind of national mental breakdown in America.

We are in a crisis of conscience, and I am convinced that we are faced with a desperate need for a change in our present policy. I hope that what I shall say will help you in your thinking. And beyond that, may lead you to take certain steps which I'm going to suggest. I do not ask, of course, I do not expect, that you will agree with all that I have to say. But I do expect you, I beseech you, I call upon you as a concerned Christian and an earnest citizen to read, to study, to find out about the issues at stake in our present policies in Vietnam. It is not my task to be a political or economic or military analyst. Of course, I have no expertise in these matters at all. But I have been doing a lot of reading and a great deal of thinking and soul searching about Vietnam. And as a moral leader, and a concerned citizen I know that I am responsible for what my government does. Responsible expression of disagreement and dissent is the lifeblood of democracy. To speak out is an exercise of faith and the ultimate loyalty of Christian and Jew alike is not to government, but to God alone. In this crisis of conscience, as in all other issues that race us "...we must obey God rather than men." if and when ultimate loyalty to God compels dissent from government, the Church must stand behind those who exercise that ultimate loyalty. There is no time when the integrity of religious faith or democratic procedures are in greater jeopardy than when the right of

issent is challenged. Too often, the charge is made that to disagree with the Johnson policies is to be disloyal to our land. I know that some of you disagree with what I'm saying, and would justify our present policies. So in all fairness, I want to try to speak to the assumptions that underlie your support of what we are doing.

I am sure that you would want to claim that this is a war of Communist aggression from the North, and we have a commitment to defend the South. But is this assumption really accurate? As almost all studies of the history of the Vietnam War now show, the war did not begin as a Communist invasion or aggression from the North. It began as a civil war in the South. Our enemy in the South, the Vietcong, is Communist. The Vietnamese are fighting a civil war in which both sides are receiving outside aid nor from North Vietnam and North America. Those who justify our commitment in Vietnam in terms of the 1954 SEATO Treaty should be sure to note that there is no provision to make our military presence mandatory. As Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr. puts it: "No president of the United States before President Johnson interpreted the SEATO Treaty as compelling American military intervention, and no other signatories so interpret the Treaty today."

Another assumption to justify our presence in Vietnam is this: If we do not stop Communism at this point, it will spread throughout the rest of the world. This is sometimes called the domino theory. We're not hearing as much about it as we did. This assumes that Communism is a vast monolith - everywhere always the same. But is this true? Nationalism is really the eroding force that is wearing Communism down. Think of the open hostility between Russia and China, between Albania and Russia. Think of Yugoslavia's independence from Russia, and our foreign policy with them clearly recognizes this. The fact that two nations are Communist does not mean that they are aligned together. Just at the very time when we are saying that we must stop Communism in Vietnam, we are coming to terms with it elsewhere ...extending trade in Eastern Europe, giving support to Tito, and writing new treaty agreements with Russia. When will we as a people finally recognize that the real enemy today is poverty and human deprivation? Communism is a tragically wrong answer to the problem of poverty. As long as we merely fight Communism, poverty will increase. To the degree that we make a frontal attack on poverty and human need and anguish, Communism which feeds on poverty and hunger will be deprived of its major appeal in the world.

Another conviction of those who support our policies is this: We should win the war as quickly as possible using whatever means are necessary. This is the argument of General Curtis LeMay who has suggested that we "bomb Hanoi back into the Stone Age." But what kind of an assumption is it that whoever has power is entitled to use it any way he pleases? Do you remember the moral position we took in conducting the Nuremberg trials in 1945? We condemned Germans to death and imprisonment because they had attacked civilian strongholds, leveled towns to the ground, destroyed the fields around them, engaged in a "scorched earth" policy, and claimed they were morally not responsible. They had only obeyed orders from above! But we condemned them and sentenced many to death, and imprisonment. I ask you, what has happened to our national conscience that we can utterly condemn a policy in 1945 and endorse it in 1967? What has happened to us as a people? How would it stand with us today if we were to be judged by the standards we employed at Nuremberg? Yes, we can bomb Vietnam back to the Stone Age. We are proving, aren't we, that we are militarily superior. Surely, by now, we have demonstrated to Russia and China that we can move the necessary troops and equipment to make an all-out war half way around the globe. We can destroy Vietnam. But what would we have in the end? A decimated land, an enraged people, and the ill-will of most of the world. We will totally wipe out what we claim we are there to save. Is this the way to commend democracy, and to stem the tide of Communism with people who are searching?

A fourth argument is that our policymakers have access to information not available to us. Therefore, we must trust them and support them. Now, any wide-spread acceptance of this

argument will spell the end of the democratic process. Our leaders are accountable to the people. They must justify what they do, or be voted out of office. Access to information doesn't necessarily mean that decisions based on that information are the only decisions possible, or even the correct ones. The so-called "experts" in Washington are by no means of one mind about what we should be doing. We must demand continuing debate by the experts. To uncritically accept what our policymakers decide to do, may be tragic indeed.

The fifth argument in support of our present direction is this: If we criticize our nation's policies, it will suggest to the world that we are divided. It's true. We are divided! We do disagree. But is this an unfortunate truth? To express difference of opinion is not something to be ashamed about. Thank God we can! In a dictatorship the goal is to have everyone think alike. In a democracy, responsible expression of different points of view is what our forefathers died for. To insist that criticism is unpatriotic is already to have started down the road to totalitarianism!

Lastly, so the argument goes: This is a dirty, messy war, and we shouldn't have gotten into it. But now that we're there, all we can do is stay there and win. This is one of the most common arguments for remaining in Vietnam. We must see it through. Do we really have no choice but to continue doing this dirty, messy thing over there? There is no point, I believe, to a discussion of how we got there. We are there. And many, thoughtful, responsible people in Washington and elsewhere are saying we got there in a series of mistakes. No sinister calculation on anyone's part. We simply blundered step by step into our preset dilemma. The alternatives now? Escalate and win a military victory with all of the further loss of life and the real possibility of blundering into World War III? Go to the other extreme and withdraw our forces and come home? No. This would admit defeat, and it would confess that 100,000 American casualties would have been all in vain.

But is this a war we can really win anyway? When one has chosen a wrong course, whether by accident, or by lack of foresight, or even deliberately, the only remedy is to change one's course. Over 13,000 young Americans have now died in Vietnam. But they will not have died in vain if we now choose the path of honesty and humility, and compassion. I believe the country they died for is big enough to admit its mistakes, to take a stand for human life, rather than death and destruction...for creativity rather than desolation...for the honor that comes for self-correction, rather than the questionable honor that comes from saving face. Listen to this! We must hear this! "You shall have no other gods before me." "We must obey God rather than men." God will peace on earth, not war. God is love, not hate. Make no mistake about it, he shall call upon us to make answer for our actions. When we meet him face to face, whether in this hour, or later, what will we say? "Lord, my tongue was tied. I couldn't say anything. Besides, it wouldn't have done any good to have spoken out." Our ultimate loyalty must be to God. His judgment is a measurement of our actions alongside those of Christ...what he said, what he did, why he died.

Why my anguish? The last quality of a doomed man or a doomed city, or a doomed nation is moral blindness. At the heart of the Gospel of Christ is the word "repent." It literally means "to turn around," "to take a new direction," or "to have another mind." As a Christian nation, I can think of no action for which there is more call. We shall ultimately have to sit down at a negotiating table. Let us do it now and seek a negotiated peace. To find it will be torturous and slow. It will take all the diplomatic expertise that Americans have ever employed. Just as the risks of extending the war are great, so too the risks of seeking a negotiated peace are great. BUT THIS IS WHAT WE MUST ASK OUR LEADERS TO SEEK NOW! We do have an obligation. Silence and inaction are no longer purely irresponsible. They are, I believe, immoral. You must speak out. Silence condones what is taking place. If you support our present course in Vietnam, then say so, and for heaven's sake, let's discuss it and debate it in the open. If you disagree, then you must also be bold enough to say so loudly, clearly,

and openly.

I want to urge upon your conscience this morning to write, or wire, or talk with our congressman and Senators...to urge them to be very clear with us about their position. I fervently trust that you can also urge them to do all in their power to leave no effort untried to find a peaceful solution to this tragic conflict. We are facing a most difficult and dangerous period in the history of mankind. We are helping to write it. We must remember that we are not to assign blame for the past, but to accept responsibility for the future...not to condemn, but to help to find reconciliation...not to proceed self-righteously and indistinctly...but to walk humbly and repentantly. God have mercy on us if we do otherwise!

* * * * *

FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE

The following statement was passed by the Student Council
at its meeting on November 28, 1967.

There may come a time when the Christian citizen, in response to an allegiance which transcends national interests, must refuse to cooperate with policies which he believes to be immoral or unjust. Such action is not to be undertaken lightly, but should be initiated only after attempts to influence policy through normal channels have been frustrated and after all consequences have been carefully considered.

In the Princeton Seminary community, several persons have reached this point with respect to the war in Vietnam and the current selective service system. Some of us concur with this protest against an immoral and unjust war, and except for the weight of social and personal responsibilities, would join them in the turning in of draft cards; others of us object to our country's Vietnam policy, but feel that the returning of draft cards is not the most effective strategy to pursue at this time; still others are concerned about Vietnam and inequities in the draft, but are seeking fuller understanding of the issues before committing themselves to dissent. But all of us believe that one who acts in faithfulness to his conscience, after consideration of his responsibilities, must be supported in his freedom to dissent. Therefore, we, the Student Council of Princeton Theological Seminary, affirm the right of these members of our community to act in accordance with their personal convictions.

Specifically,

-) We support those who have found draft resistance to be the sincere expression of their conscience in acting as they feel they must.
-) We pledge to give any tangible support within our means which may be required as a consequence of their action and to assist these students in obtaining legal counsel by helping to raise necessary money for their adequate legal protection.
-) We urge the Seminary administration to do the following:
 - a) Issue a statement in support of the right of these students to act in accordance with their consciences.
 - b) Insure that all enquiring legal authorities be dealt with on an administrative level before permitting them to approach the students individually.

Our hope is that the action of these students will help to sharpen our awareness of Christian responsibility in an historical situation and will promote meaningful discussion and action within the Seminary community. We urge all students who agree with this statement to join us by signing their signature of support.

THE OTHER NAZARENE

Laird J. Stuart

It is very cold here in the hills, always very cold this time of year. When the wind moves the rug that is hung, there, over the opening to our cave, we can see the snow falling outside. If you go outside by a light when it is snowing at night, the flakes that fall in the shadows where the light is not bright look black. If you were unfortunate enough to be outside in such a night, you might see a light like ours scan the blackness when the wind moved the rug. But if you did not get inside it would be hard on you out there.

We are safe now, but also very idle. When it is like this we do not go out and raid caravans. It is too hard on all of us, camels and men.

In the cave there are five. Within the area of these mountains in their own caves, there are many more of us. It is strange how we have all come to this cave this winter. We are from different tribes and from different areas of the desert below, some of us from towns, others from the desert itself. Two of us are from the towns, but we ride as well as the others. The men from the desert are crude.

You can be very free in the mountains. And on the nearby desert there are many places for good raids and quick escapes. In towns it is different. There you are very close to many types of people. If you are born to a family like mine, you work hard to make very little money. Everything we have is ours. We do not pay taxes like the people in town. Ha!

Sometimes the kings make everyone pay a special tax. Names of those who pay are put on tablets. Such work. Once when a tax was being paid, the town over that way, Bethlehem, was very crowded. People even stayed in stables. This one time, a stranger from our area had a baby in one of the stables. It is true. A boy they say. People say that one of the new religious people who was in this region lately was born during such a time, in a stable, to a virgin! Imagine such a tale! I wonder if it is the same one, for he was known as a Nazarene, and was the son of a carpenter too.

I heard of him from people in the markets. We go into the towns sometimes when we must buy food and other things. It is very funny for we are most polite to the merchants. They are all Jews. There is much talk in the markets. Lately I heard he was dead, the religious man from our country, and such other tales about him as would make you wonder about people. I do often up here in the cave.

It is my guess he stirred up too much trouble and was not careful like we are. When you take something from people they get angry. So you must give them something else, or get away, or maybe even kill them. It was crucifixion. Such a hard, bitter death to bear.

This is a very cold night. The cave is small for five. Especially when there are women. I will live alone someday, perhaps, with a good woman now and then, sharing nothing with others who are not as good at this as I am.

It is, I think, the coldest night I remember. The wind must have raced out of the blackest part of the sky. And we try to exile it with our blankets.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 5, No. 6

January 12, 1968

JANUARY ISSUE

"Our Winter Discontents"

The editors present several recent submissions coincidentally speaking to one issue in seminary education: the frustrating tension between the discovery of one's self and the mastery of established standards of professional competence.

WHAT'S IN A TEST?	Mrs. Marion Jenkins
GOING THROUGH HELL	Cliff Baker
THEN, LATER? NOW OR NEVER!	Richard Young
REFLECTIONS BY A WORRIED MIDDLEMAN	James Crawford

THE EDITORS

Howard Happ	Andrew Woods	Theodore Atkinson	William LeMosy
Joseph Preston	Carol Moseley	George Dosier	John Mulholland

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Friday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

WHAT'S IN A TEST?

Marion Jenkins

From time to time on the Seminary Campus, there has been a great deal of discussion on the subject of General Examinations. I would like to take this opportunity to express my views on the subject.

It is almost axiomatic to say that what is professed at the local level of the Church is dependent upon what is professed at the Seminary level of the Church. Furthermore, it is generally acknowledged by those persons who are in a position to judge that Princeton Theological Seminary is the most influential seminary in the Presbyterian household of faith. In addition, by the very fact that over fifty denominations of Christian faith are represented in our student body, it must be acknowledged that our school heavily influences the Universal Christian Church.

The Seminary has divided its curriculum into four major divisions. Each division represents an area of study necessary for the well-being of the Church. If an individual is to minister effectively to a congregation, and if a congregation, in turn, is to be influential in the affairs of the community and society in general, that minister must have some competence in each of the four major divisions of knowledge. There is a basic minimum knowledge in each of the four areas that is absolutely necessary to provide a balance whereby the prospective minister will be enabled to minister to the needs of his entire congregation. It would seem that the curriculum committee of the Seminary has sought to provide for this basic balance of knowledge and yet to allow the individual student the greatest amount of personal freedom of study through a system of General Examinations.

General Examinations are designed to test the student on the basic factual knowledge that is required in each area. This knowledge may be acquired through reading a specified number of books on a given syllabus and by taking a minimal number of required courses. Through this system the student is freed to elect those lecture courses in which he is most interested and for which he feels the greatest personal need.

It is fairly obvious, I think, that this system is based upon and dependent upon the integrity and maturity of the student. This system assumes that the student recognizes the essentially vital nature of the knowledge in each department. This system assumes that the student wants to know the material on a given syllabus and is not interested in "just getting by." This system assumes, furthermore, that the student has the maturity to recognize the areas of his own limitations which need strengthening through course work, and that he is able to objectively evaluate whatever gifts he may have and to develop them accordingly.

A second consideration of a Curriculum Committee should be the overall effect of a given system upon the church at large. It can rightly be said that whatever the emphasis within the Seminary, the same will be the emphasis that prevails in the church at large. If a balance of the knowledge within the four departments is desirable and necessary for the future ministry of an individual student, then it would also seem that a balance of the four departments within the Seminary is desirable and essential for the overall well-being of the church.

This year it is reported, unofficially, that fifty percent of the seniors have placed their senior concentration in one department. Should this trend continue, this department

would be forced to expand its teaching staff, facilities, etc., to accommodate the influx, which would be all to the good were it not at the expense of the other three departments. If the majority of the students elect their courses from only one department, the other three departments will, in time, be forced to reduce teaching schedules and faculty members. It is not the personal interest of any individual student or group of students that establishes the validity of any one of the four departments; it is the nature of the Gospel itself. It seems to me, therefore, that it is imperative that at least a relative balance be maintained among the four departments.

It is difficult to determine why such an imbalance should take place within the Seminary Community. Some of the problem may lie within the realm of the individual student. It may well be that a larger percentage of the student body does not have the maturity and objectivity which was originally assumed by the curriculum committee. Some students may find that good grades in one department are easier to make than in another and hence are drawn to that department. Some students may be so interested in their own personal likes and dislikes that they are selling themselves short in their preparation for their eventual full-time ministry.

On the other hand, the practices and policies within the department may be in some measure responsible for some of the imbalance. One department with easier course requirements than the others, invites the concentration of the student who desires not to prepare himself for a ministry, but only to get his degree and become "activated."

Another means whereby the student may be encouraged to place extra emphasis on a given department is in the matter of giving the General Examinations themselves. Tests that are excessively easy merit the scorn of the conscientious, concerned student, but attract to the department those students who wish to "get by," because it is a "push-over." When tests are excessively difficult, it is soon "noised abroad" that if one wishes to pass a given General, he had better take extra courses in that department. So the result is that, in addition to those legitimate students who are concentrating in a certain department for the right reasons, we also have a number of students there who would not be, were the testing more uniform.

The solution to the overall problem is difficult to say, but a few suggestions seem to be in order. Since the present system seems to be built upon a particular student image of maturity and objectivity, it might be well to investigate and see if the image conforms to the actuality.

It would be difficult to attempt to make all courses conform to a uniform degree of difficulty because of the very nature of the material involved in a given department. There are operative at the present time maximum standards for course work, so unless there was a redistribution of courses among the departments it would seem that the disparity is unavoidable.

General examinations within a given department, however, can and should be uniform. Whenever a department administers a test at one time of the year, and no one fails, and in the successive test, based upon the same material, more than fifty percent of the group fail, it would strongly indicate that the department does not have well-defined objectives in mind. This kind of testing is to be condemned because it destroys the basic philosophy of course choice upon which our system is built, encourages students to compromise their integrity, and contributes to an imbalance among the departments.

I have taken the opportunity to place this problem before the academic community, not because I believe I have the answer to this problem, but because I believe it is a

serious problem that is of utmost concern to every Christian on the Campus who believes that the Living Lord yet works through his Church--the Body of Believers--to spread his Gospel into all the world.

* * * * *

GOING THROUGH HELL

A Sermon

Cliff Baker

This sermon, my "middler sermon," was preached in Miller Chapel on November 7 to fellow classmates of my Preaching Practicum, to representatives of the homiletics and speech faculties, and to some friends who care.

Working on this sermon has literally changed my life, for it has not only given me an opportunity to release some of my hostilities and frustrations at being in Princeton Seminary through confronting head-on some of the many devils which plague all of us here, but it has also shown me the direction in which I may continue to move through an always richer experience of life.

Such is the confidence that we have through Christ toward God. Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to claim anything as coming from us; our sufficiency is from God, who has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit; for the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life. II Corinthians 3:4-6

Where shall I begin? There are so many thoughts and feelings flying around inside me, crying to get out, that I don't know where I should start. I'll start with you.

No, I can't start with you because I don't know you. I'll have to begin with myself. That's what this is all about, really: myself. But I hope that after a while it will be about you also, that you will become involved in it with me.

I don't know how you describe this place, but to me it is Hell. Princeton Seminary is HELL! It's as if the Devil himself had his headquarters here. It's Hell because I don't know why I am here. It's Hell because I am constantly being bombarded with new and bewildering ideas which pull my legs out from under me and leave me lying senseless on the ground. It's Hell because . . . because there is too much doing without thinking, too much unfeeling academic routine. There is not enough being, not enough becoming . . . not enough caring. Princeton Seminary is Hell because I have to stand up here in this wooden box, dressed in these uncomfortable clothes, and pretend to preach a sermon while you guys sit in those uncomfortable pews and make little marks and little remarks in your evaluation sheets about what I am doing and saying. How am I expected to preach a sermon in a laboratory box, when nobody cares about me? What's really important here: me, or my sermon; you, or my sermon? Which is really more important: living LIFE, or getting a theological degree?

Or, to put it another way, who qualifies a man to be a minister of the gospel? Is it the seminary? The Presbytery maybe? Ourselves, somehow? I don't believe so. None of

these is sufficient to qualify a man for the ministry. Not even a man with his BD from Union, his ThM from Yale, and his ThD from Princeton is qualified to be a minister of the gospel. All of these degrees are not enough . . . and they may even be too much.

What a man needs to be a minister of the gospel is so simple that it is usually overlooked in a place such as this. And yet it is so real, so vital, that not even Princeton Seminary, with all of its prestige, tradition, and other rigamarole, is capable of producing this qualification in its men and women. Who really qualifies us to be ministers? It is God himself, and God alone "who has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant." There would be no reason whatever for our being here this morning, no reason for the existence of these walls, this building, this chapel--this institution--if that were not so. God himself is the reason and the inspiration for this . . . place . . . and we need to remind ourselves of that fact. "Our sufficiency is from God!", not from ourselves, not from our diploma, not from anything we can see or read or hear, but from God!

Of what then are we qualified to be ministers? --of a new covenant. Not an old worn out written code of rules, but a new existence which is of the Spirit, the Spirit which gives life, not the written code which gives death. And I want life, not death. I have been here over two years, and nearly all I have seen from this place is death. The life which does manage to exist here has to hide out in little vest pockets of resistance, and one is extremely fortunate if he manages to stumble onto one of these persons, or groups of persons--who care. Many persons die here every year.

I am not preparing to be a minister; I am not going to be a minister. By the grace of God, I am a minister . . . right now. And if God has not so ordained me, if he has not so ordained us, then we had better leave right now. If we are not all right now ministering to each others as we participate together in this class, then we have no reason to be here, for the Spirit of life is not with us. And if the Spirit of God which gives life is not working in and through us at this moment, then we are all dead men. And if we are dead men, then we might as well let the seminary bury us, for we are of no use to God; we are fit only to be more fuel for the fires of this Hell.

My standing up here and talking about the need for ministry here won't necessarily make me a better minister to you. Your agreeing or disagreeing with me isn't going to do much to make life any more bearable or miserable for us here. Your congratulating me at the end of this class, or your unwillingness to meet my eye and speak a word with me isn't going to answer to any of these problems. We're all in this together. You and me. You my fellow students and you my professors who are preparing to criticize my exegesis and delivery and diction--you're in it too. Whether we like it or not we have been given responsibility toward one another--not merely to go through the motions of a class, this class--but actually to be for one another what we are trying to learn to be for that congregation "out there" somewhere: ministers. We are here right now. We have a ministry right here, right now. We have the qualification from God to administer the new covenant--the Gospel, if you will--in the Spirit of life. So that we don't have to die here, chained to the written code, but that we might have life. Is that too much to ask of God? Is that too much to ask of each other? Where is the "confidence we have through Christ toward God?"

I said that Princeton Seminary is Hell. And I mean just exactly that. Going through Hell is not necessarily a totally negative experience, provided you are actually going through Hell, not making it a permanent dwelling place. Hell is no heaven, and there is no heaven in Princeton Seminary. If this place were heaven, there would be no reason

for our being here in the first place. We have descended into this Hell to go through it, so that we might be better equipped to help lead others through their own hells. But let's not lose sight of our brothers here, let's not lose sight of each other, who are also in Hell. Too many of us are losing our very lives here, and no one notices, no one care . . . because we are all blind.

In our blindness we go around pinning labels on each other, and then we don't have to deal with each other as persons . . . I'm not a label--I'm a person, and so are you. And because I am a person you can't avoid treating me as who I am without destroying me. If you can look right at me without seeing me, if you can hear my words without really listening to me, then I might as well be dead. And every time someone looks through me or past me without seeing me, a little more of me dies.

There are some of you here whom I have known by name for over a year, some of you whose names I don't know, but most of you I don't know at all. To me you make yourself in some way unapproachable. Perhaps I seem the same way to you--aloof, irritable, unfriendly--not the kind of person you would feel comfortable with. Well, that's how I feel about most of you. But sometimes I wish that some of you would make yourselves more available to me, because I need your understanding, your support, your acknowledgment of me as who I am. Perhaps some of you have felt the same way about me. What keeps us separated from each other? Why can't we begin to get together?

But for me it takes a great deal of courage to take a tentative step toward you--I'm scared of you! You arouse all my feelings of insecurity and paranoia, and if you don't respond to my move toward you, or if you repulse it, I am much more afraid to make another attempt to move toward you at another time. Some of you have made moves toward me, and I have turned you away. You see how much we all need to experience forgiveness - from each other.

Where is our confidence in God? He has qualified us to be ministers. We are free to approach each other having this confidence. We can expose our selves, who we really are, to each other. Paul says that it is God, God himself, and only God, who qualifies us to be ministers. We receive our credentials from God . . . not from men, not from institutions, but from God. We are free from the tightness of these institutional structures. They still exist, we still abide by them . . . but they no longer bind us. We don't have to be afraid of each other any more. We are free to be who we are with each other. We don't have to hide anymore behind the barbed wire and concrete walls of institutions or of intellectual games.

I stand before you naked. This is you I am. I need you to help me, all of you. If you can't look me in the eye when you leave this place, or if I can't look you in the eye when I see you somewhere else, then nothing has happened between us here. I need you to minister to me; you need me to minister to you. Both of us have a long way to go, but that is no reason, no excuse for not beginning our ministry right now right here. God has already qualified us to be ministers. I wonder what we are waiting for? How can I minister to you unless you first minister to me? And how can you minister to me unless I first minister to you? God has already taken the initiative for us: he has given us sufficient qualification to be ministers of his new covenant--GOOD NEWS!--and we who have heard and received the Spirit of life in the new covenant are now privileged to live in it.

I want LIFE! I can have life only if you care.

THEN, LATER?
NOW OR NEVER!

Richard Young

The psycheling
pseasons
pset
my psoul's
psensations
pspinning.
For psummer's pspent
and my phreedom
phell with
the phall.

Returning to
the academic womb
of alma mater,
I crouch prenatal
at my desk
and prepare to
terminate my
embrionic existence
in nine more month's
long labor.

My mind struggles
to escape and
cooly to meander over
archtypical images of
bronze-bodied,
bikinied, blonde
summer,
beneath trees
tenting a grassy glade,
losing my-self in
a multimedia
massage till
the message
telegraphs
all the way
to our mutual toes.

But my mind is
caught
in a print-and-paper prison,
fried between the lines
of type
bold-facing me.
While the syllabus
shapes my consciousness
and the faculty forms
my identity,
the animation of being
is suspended for
the business of becoming.

Until my diploma birth-right
is penned and I am allowed to
commence
being
a person
I wonder to see
"Who will I BE;
will
I
be
me?"

REFLECTIONS BY A WORRIED MIDDLE

James Crawford

"Seminary.... 2. An institution for the training of candidates for the priesthood or ministry...." So says Noah Webster. Granted, it is the second meaning for the word, but it is undoubtedly the most commonly understood meaning. Contrary to the supplications of Mr. Hickey (cf., "Reflections By a Worried Senior;" Viewpoint; Vol. 5, No. 3; Nov. 10, 1967), and contrary to the pronouncements of our esteemed administrations, Princeton Theological Seminary is neither a place where one is meant to come "to learn who we are," nor is it the full equivalent of any graduate school in the country.

One does not learn who one is any more than one may "learn" to have faith. Both are a part of our growth. No amount of withdrawal (be it contemplative or whatever) will teach you who you are, and whatever else it may be, seminary is a withdrawal from the real world. We are men of that real world - a world filled with violence, hatred, suffering (physical, as opposed to pseudo-emotional), poverty (economic, as opposed to moral), simplicity, beauty, love - and that real world contains as much of the sacred as it does of the profane (if such a separation is valid any longer).

We have been pampered so long that very few of us could live for long in that world if we carried our "hang-ups" into it with us. And what are these "hang-ups": depression - as a rationalization for laziness; despondency - as a substitute for facing failure head on; questioning the strength of our faith in Christ - as a diversionary movement around the fact that we have no faith.

The time for mystic contemplation is gone. If you haven't learned who you are by the time you reach 21 or 22, then don't come to seminary. Face the reality of our "national religion": join the army. You don't believe in war? Then face the sufferings that so many "secular" C.O.'s must go through. If necessary, face the reality of a courtroom where "Truth is not the issue!" (cf., The New York Times account of the "trial" of Captain Howard Levy), and the possibility of serving 3-5 years "alternate service" in federal prison.

I don't deny that throughout our lives we are going through a redefinition of our identity, nor do I deny that many people (perhaps an inordinate number of seminarians) have legitimate mental and emotional problems. For the latter I suggest some other form of therapy than a Church vocation. Start out by admitting your inadequacies, and then get out of the way. There's a real world going on outside the Velvet Vacuum of Princeton Theological Seminary, and anyone who feels the "calling" of the Church's mission in that world had better either have a very strong idea of who he is, or else be willing to work without allowing himself the luxury of such navel gazing. The time has past when the Church can be a refuge from the world for either the laity or the clergy.

Perhaps Mr. Hickey's expectations of seminary are based on his observations of the Church, but that is only a confirmation of how badly that image of the Church must be turned on its head. This seminary, along with all others, does reflect the image of the Church, and there is a crying need for radical transformation of the seminary curriculum, but the seminary does not need to be a neo-Freudian couch on which its youthful hope (presumably seminarians are the Church's youthful hope; not merely its hopeful youth) may recline, any more than the Church should be a couch for the laity. The ministry which our generation must face is going to be an exceedingly difficult one, and the fact must be faced that a pietistic concern for people and the desire to "continue the Christian

tradition," so-called, is not enough.

In every other profession the call for quality has resulted in a drastic cut in the number of those who "make it." In the ministry we seem to fear the call for more stringent intellectual and emotional characteristics. Perhaps that's because many seminarians look upon seminary as the easiest "graduate school," and the ministry as the surest and quickest road to respectability. Seminary, at the BD level, is not a graduate school (in any real academic sense), and we may well have reached the age in which a respectable minister should not, cannot be a respectable citizen.

I too was a member of Mr. Hickey's Junior Class. We were no braver then; we were simply filled with a good deal more bravado. In thinking back to that year I really cannot see any changes for the better in any of us. We shall leave here perhaps with more content to our personalities than we had upon entering, but basically those personalities have not changed. We still have the same roots; some of our branches have withered, and sometimes new ones have grown in their places. Some of us will leave here with more than we had when we arrive; some of us will leave with less.

If my ideas seem harsh to anyone, I cannot apologize, but I truly feel very sorry. To you I commend Mr. Webster's primary meaning for "seminary": "1. An academy; now, often, a private secondary school." What's a "secondary school": "A school providing secondary education, as an American high school or an English public school." For those of you who can understand my cry for "help," I commend Camus: "As soon as one does not kill oneself, one must keep silent about life.... If you are convinced of your despair, you must either act as if you did hope after all - or kill yourself. Suffering gives no rights." And Proverbs 4, verse 23: "Keep your heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life."

* * * * *

CONTRIBUTORS

MRS. MARION JENKINS is a Senior B.D. candidate from Wyoming, who is a graduate of Westminster College.

CLIFF BAKER is a senior B.D. student from Seattle. He did his undergraduate work at Whitworth College.

RICHARD YOUNG, a frequent contributor of poetry to Viewpoint, is a senior from Yakima, Washington, and a graduate of Whitworth College.

JAMES CRAWFORD is a graduate of Valparaiso University. After his Junior year here he spent a year of graduate study at The New School for Social Research in New York City. Most recently, he was one of four Princeton Seminarians who turned in their draft cards in protest to the Vietnam War.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 5, No. 7

February 9, 1968

CONSCIENCE AND THE WAR: SOME QUESTIONS	Dr. George S. Hendry
SIX THESES ON THE QUESTION OF THE IV-D CLASSIFICATION.....	Andrew Woods
INFORMAL OPINION POLL ON VIETNAM	
EDIFYING WORDS PERTAINING TO THE RIGHT WORSHIP OF GOD AT SUPPER FOR THE THOUGHTFUL AND PIOUS OF THE SEMINARY, WITH ADVICE FOR THE IMPIOUS AND UNINSTRUCTED	Rod Hunter
PARTICIPATION IN CHRIST	Dr. James N. Lapsley

THE EDITORS

Howard Happ	Andrew Woods	Theodore Atkinson	William LeMosy
Joseph Preston	Carol Moseley	George Dosier	John Mulholland

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Friday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

CONSCIENCE AND THE WAR: SOME QUESTIONS

George S. Hendry

The appeal to conscience in justification of refusal to be conscripted for the war in Vietnam, which has been made by Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam and which has been endorsed by Dr. West in VIEWPOINT of December 1 and supported in the statement of the Student Council in VIEWPOINT of Dec. 8, raises a number of questions which need clarification.

Selective conscientious objection, as distinct from absolute pacifism, is a relatively new concept in the long-standing argument between Christians and the state. It may correspond more closely to the way in which conscience actually operates in the experience of Christians. And only a conscience which relates to particular acts, rather than general principles, could have a place in a contextual or situational ethic. But the suggestion that the Selective Service Act should be amended so as to recognise conscientious objection to a particular war, which has been advanced by various people and has been reportedly endorsed by Senator Eugene McCarthy, presents serious difficulties from the legislative point of view.

Conscientious objection to war as such is recognised by the present law on the theory that in this case conscience is actuated by purely religious principles, unmixed with any political considerations. This may be a debatable view of conscience, but at least it is one which the state can easily identify. The conscientious objector, on this view, is the man who refuses to take up arms under any circumstances, not even (to take the stock example) if he sees his wife and daughters raped and done to death by a brutal soldiery.

It is hard to see how objection to a particular war, however conscientious, can be made without some admixture of political judgment. This is not to say that war is exempt from moral judgment; but a war is a form of political action, and a moral judgment is inevitably compounded with political considerations. Conscience can hardly be invoked here without recourse to casuistry. Dr. West wrote in his article: "The state has the right of self-defense against those who wish its destruction by the victory of the enemy. But there is no such danger to-day. The undeclared war in Vietnam, however much one might defend it in terms of United States interests and commitments, poses no conceivable threat to the existence of this country. The conscientious objectors with whom we are concerned here are patriots who are opposing our government's actions there out of sincere concern for the best interest and the good name of our country." This is an excellent example of casuistry; first the right of the state to defend itself is stated as a general principle (of natural law?), then it is asserted that this principle is not applicable to the present situation. The latter assertion, however, is a political judgment, and conscientious objectors who make it cannot hide from the fact behind a smoke-screen of meliorative epithets.

If the conscientious objectors are patriots acting out of sincere concern for the best interest of the country, are we to conclude that those who hold a different view of the best interest of the country are less than patriots, less than sincere, less than conscientious? One of the disturbing features of the present debate is the assumption, tacitly held, that those who object to participation in the war in Vietnam are the sole repositories of conscience. It is surely gratuitous to assume that those who support the war, especially the President and his advisers, are men bereft of conscience. True, the government is empowered to enforce its policies, but it does not follow that those who make these policies are not conscientious patriots acting out of sincere concern for the

best interest of the country. What the best interest of the country is is always for debate within the framework of the democratic process. The claim of conscience as a privileged sanctuary for one point of view is analogous to the use of Cambodia by the Vietcong.

There is a further question which ought to be considered. If the government were to concede the right of any citizen to object on grounds of conscience to the war in Vietnam, not because it involves the taking of life, but because he judges it not to be in "the best interest" of the country, would this not establish a precedent which might be invoked to justify refusal to cooperate with any policy of the government of which he did not approve? For example, there are many citizens - and I number myself among them - who object to the space program and who hold, patriotically, sincerely and conscientiously, that the best interest of the country is not served by the expenditure of vast sums of public money to send a man to the moon while the oppressed minorities and depressed areas of the country are crying out for help. Indeed, it may be open to question whether such lunatic expenditure is authorised under the general welfare clause of the Constitution. If those who object to this project share the same concept of conscience as the conscientious objectors to the war in Vietnam, would they not be entitled, if not bound, to claim the right to withhold that portion of their income-tax which is allocated to the space program?

* * * * *

SIX THESES ON THE QUESTION OF THE IV-D CLASSIFICATION

Andrew Woods

I hope that the following theses which are directed to the question of whether there should be a IV-D classification for seminarians and clergymen will contribute to the discussion of that question. I oppose our military involvement in Vietnam. Our actions there are unwise and unjust. Our national interest is to act in a way that strengthens Vietnam against Chinese expansion and supports the progressive, nationalist forces in the area; we are doing the very opposite. We should de-escalate our effort in order to lead to a withdrawal of our forces. Our present policy can be changed at this point by legal means. It can only be changed if more and more voters are persuaded that our present course is wrong. Illegal and bizarre forms of protest are not likely to achieve this aim. Though they may serve to focus public attention on the issue of the war, they are more likely to alienate the very public the protesters should be hoping to persuade. Now that my general stance has been presented, let us focus on the question of IV-D.

1. It has been said that we should renounce our IV-D status because with it the government has "bought us off" so that we do not face the dilemma faced by other men our age. It is claimed that if we do speak out on the war we will not be heard because we are "safe." Since we are not putting ourselves in jeopardy, we are not taken seriously. There is some truth in this position, but we should remember that from a IV-D status we can speak out with a freedom and influence that is denied others. No one can seriously claim that in opposing the war we are trying to "save our own skins," that we are opposing it because we personally do not want to fight or endanger our lives. Because we are "safe," we can speak out effectively. If we do speak out, we do so as citizens who are primarily concerned for the welfare of others.

2. The argument that at present I do not have to face the moral dilemma of this war is somewhat meaningless. As a citizen of this country, I do have to face it. I am as

guilty now, as I study here in Princeton, of what we are doing in Vietnam as is the man who is pulling the trigger or dropping the bombs. He is my instrument who carries out the policies of my government. As citizens we are all deeply involved. That is why the policy must be changed. I am no less guilty if I go to jail. We are no less guilty if we ourselves are not fighting. We are responsible for the policies of our government. The Greeks are not responsible for the actions of the government. The Russians are not responsible for all their government does. Our republican form of government is in constant danger, but this is still a republic. I voted for LBJ; I am represented in Congress.

3. The IV-D status serves to protect freedom of speech (particularly freedom of the pulpit). The clergy can criticize the government freely without the direct threat of being removed from their pulpits by the state and sent to the front, as they were in Germany. One of the most deplorable things about General Hershey is that he sees military service as a form of punishment. This manner of thinking is an insult to the men in military service. The thing to remember, however, is that if induction is used to stifle dissent the IV-D status does serve to protect seminarians and clergy from suppression of their right to express their views freely.

4. As more and more graduate deferments are eliminated, the theological schools may become some of the last bastions of the "humanities" that are still able to function freely at full strength. Graduate disciplines that are not directly related to "national defense" are in trouble at the very time when our nation needs the perspective that can be offered by the historian and the understanding of man that can be offered by the other non-scientific disciplines. Our whole society suffers if there is an imbalance between the disciplines that develop the tools of our society and the disciplines that attempt to determine how those tools are to be used for the good of man. As long as the IV-D status remains, at least one discipline that seeks to know man and give moral guidance and direction to our society is allowed to continue its efforts relatively unimpeded by the needs of this war. This is good for the whole society.

5. Freedom develops and is sustained in a society where there is a system of checks and balances that prevents one part of a government or one institution in the society from dominating. The founders of this country showed great wisdom in establishing our form of government. They showed a profound awareness of human sin and lust for power. The first amendment to the Constitution establishes the separation of Church and state for the benefit of both institutions and the whole society. Each has rights over against the other. Neither can dominate the other. The IV-D status is related to the stipulation that the Congress shall make no law "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion. An atmosphere of political freedom gradually grew in medieval Europe because of the conflict between Church and state. Each would have liked to become a tyranny, but the existence of the other constantly prevented this. The universities and traditions of academic freedom were able to develop because of the rights the Church had vis-a-vis the state. Students were classified as clergy and could not be drafted or prosecuted by the civil courts. Although this status was abused, it did much to promote academic freedom and, ultimately, freedom in the society at large. The presence of the churches today and what rights they do have serve to limit the power of the state and promote the freedom of the society as a whole.

6. We have been discussing a right that the Church has for its clergy and future clergy not to be impressed into military service against their will. In this country the government has honored that right. If the state denies that right, the church should still insist upon it and, if need be, suffer for it as it did before Constantine. Given the present situation, it would be extremely unwise and foolish for the Church to advocate the removal of the IV-D status.

INFORMAL OPINION POLL ON VIETNAM

Before the Christmas recess a group of students took an opinion poll of the student body concerning the war in Vietnam. It was not the purpose of the group to prove or disprove any particular viewpoint, but merely to measure student opinion.

The poll consisted of seven possible positions, of which one was to be checked. Students were allowed to write their own opinions or to alter and then check one of the printed positions. It is for this reason that 52 ballots have been tabulated separately to indicate the nature of the changes made and the rewritten positions.

Those of us who conducted this poll do not feel that the results are suitable as "evidence" for any particular point of view. We feel that such a purpose would require a far more comprehensive poll.

POSITIONS

- A. I am convinced that this is an immoral and unjust war, am interested in ways of resisting it, and am in favor of immediate, unilateral withdrawal.
- B. I am uncertain about the morality or necessity of this war, but favor immediate de-escalation of U.S. military involvement - unilateral if necessary.
- C. I am uncertain about the morality or necessity of this war, but would not favor unilateral de-escalation of U.S. military involvement at this time.
- D. I do not feel that I am in a position to come to a conclusion about the morality or necessity of this war, or about possible future strategies.
- E. I see this as a necessary (if undesirable) war, but would favor limiting our military involvement to its present level.
- F. I see this as a necessary war and feel that all necessary means should be employed to bring about the military security of South Vietnam.
- G. I am convinced that this is a just and moral war and that it is our moral and patriotic duty to secure in S. Vietnam a victory for freedom and democracy.

RESULTS

Positions	Number Checked	Number Changed Then Checked	Total
A	30	20	50
B	42	10	52
C	39	2	41
D	17	1	18
E	9	2	11
F	15	0	15
G	1	2	3

Positions	Number Checked	Number Changed Then Checked	Total
Rewrites	--	15	15
TOTAL	153	52	205

BREAKDOWN OF CHANGED AND REWRITTEN POSITIONS

A. Felt war was:	
1. unjust and immoral	35
2. uncertain of morality or injustice	8
3. necessary	5
4. just and moral	2
5. just but not moral	2
B. Favored a policy of:	
1. immediate unilateral withdrawal	4
2. immediate de-escalation	24
3. non-unilateral de-escalation	2
4. continuing current commitment	6
5. escalation	0
6. gradual withdrawal	8
7. a negotiated settlement	3
8. de-escalation, but not immediate	4
C. Persons interested in resisting the war	19
D. Christian pacifist	1

* * * * *

EDIFYING WORDS PERTAINING TO THE RIGHT WORSHIP OF GOD
AT SUPPER FOR THE THOUGHTFUL AND PIOUS OF THE SEMINARY,
WITH ADVICE FOR THE IMPIOUS AND UNINSTRUCTED

Rod Hunter

These brief remarks are intended for that portion of the seminary community which endures, night after night, the collection of disguised homilies, confessions of ingratitude and other "creative" religious ejaculations known as evening "grace." What is gracious about these often sincere, but frequently self-conscious and fumbling, attempts at public prayer is hard to see, when the daily hush in the room signals a rather general sense of apprehension among the diners and the "Amen" provokes a nervous twittering about "who it was" that "did it," and a certain craning of necks to catch a glimpse of the soul in question, who has meantime vanished into one of the table complexes near the microphone.

Now there is nothing wrong with confessing, as I think many of us must, that we do not know much about how to pray in public, or to prepare a prayer that will be simultaneously genuine to our own faith and appropriate for a public gathering. Nor, as I see it, is there anything wrong in confessing that formal prayers, written, if you will, by "experts," have something to teach us in this regard. After all, there is a difference between public and private speaking of any kind. The use of such prayers would constitute no affront to anyone's sincerity, or need not, and would very likely teach us all something we could stand to learn. I therefore call upon the Student Council,

or whatever appropriate committee thereof supervising these affairs, to consult with persons on our campus who can suggest four or five prayers to be used in the dining hall, and to direct that these be available at the head waiter's desk for those who wish to use them.

* * * * *

PARTICIPATION IN CHRIST

Scripture: John 15 : 1-17

A Meditation Delivered in Miller Chapel, October 24, 1967

One of the most persistent factors in our model of life is the illusion of apartheid - of separation. Here I am not speaking only of race relations in South Africa, though that is involved, too. For several centuries in the West our assumption has been that each of us is a separate and more or less solitary individual entity. We speak often of "contacts" with one another and interaction, but the basic way we have of envisioning the contact and interaction is that of one billiard ball striking another. We nudge, bump, and propel each other, but we do not participate in any common life. We keep urging each other to relate, as though we were not in fact relating most of the time. Our heritage of individualism has stood us in good stead in many human enterprises where initiative and boldness have been prime factors, but it has kept us from knowing the extent of our participation in a common world, whether we will it or not.

Let us examine briefly some perspectives on participation which help put our situation in a different light. First, we are all participating here in a field of electro-magnetic impulses that none of us is aware of through our senses. Yet we all know that if any of us had a radio receiver implanted somewhere on his person, he could pick up perhaps 25 AM stations and an equal number of FM stations, not to speak of numerous short wave stations, if the receiver had enough power. If this receiver were implanted in our heads, we might find ourselves at the beck and call of whoever commands the transmitter, as do some monkeys in a physiology laboratory at Yale. Second, I note the common finding of sociologists that we all tend to live and move in groups, even when we are not aware of it. Not that we all do the same thing all the time, but that we are constantly giving each other signals by which we largely govern our lives. In the third instance I mention briefly the phenomenon of the subjective awareness of participation to a greater or lesser extent which we call empathy - hard to describe and to understand, but real in the lives of many. Finally, the phenomena of extra-sensory perception, long scorned by most scientists as the product of fraud or ignorance or both, are finally coming to be recognized as something to be dealt with as such by "mainline" scientists. I recently attended a meeting of the American Psychological Association at which ESP phenomena were discussed as genuine data without anyone raising the old cry of "hoax"! These phenomena clearly show us that we are participating in a communications network which doesn't operate by sense impression alone - though to be sure, some of us are better attuned to it than others.

All these perspectives speak of our participation in a common life, whether we know it or like it or not. In their light, such words as morale and influence become discursive nouns which we don't need to regard as metaphorical. They refer to real events - one life does influence, or flow into, another.

The writer of the Fourth Gospel assumed that such was the case when he spoke of our participation in Christ in the parable of the vine which I read just a while ago. He did not have to argue that participation is possible - his readers would understand that. His point was that a certain kind of participation in Christ is necessary if we are to develop as Christians. But I have had to raise the question of the possibility of participation because we have come to assume that it is not so. Implicitly I have raised the question of metaphysics - if I may use that word in this place. Our assumption of non-participation rests upon a metaphysics which has emphasized discontinuity - the classical metaphysics of the West which goes back to Aristotle. We need a new metaphysics which will help us to understand better continuity as well as discontinuity, or else all the participatory aspects of the Christian faith, focally represented in the parable of the vine, will soon pass away. And with them probably the Christian faith also, for they are integral to it.

As some of you know, I think that process philosophy is the best model of our thinking about continuity available at present. But I am not here urging you all to adopt this point of view or any specific point of view. I am rather urging you not to fear to think speculatively about the nature of reality - to think in general terms about the world, ourselves, and God. For upon our collective ability once again to become responsible metaphysicians depends in no small measure our future as a vital community in which participation in one another's lives and in the life of Christ are live options. Do you believe that you can "abide" in him, who has been dead nearly two millenia? What does that mean to you?

* * * * *

CONTRIBUTORS

DR. GEORGE S. HENDRY is Charles Hodge Professor of Systematic Theology.

ANDREW WOODS, a member of the Viewpoint editorial staff, is a Senior B.D. student from California. He received his B.A. from the University of California at Berkeley.

ROD HUNTER, a Th.D. candidate originally from Grosse Pointe Woods, Michigan, is a graduate of this seminary and received his prior degree in Arts from Yale University. Mr. Hunter is doubtless known to many as a guide to the perplexed in lesser curriculum.

DR. JAMES N. LAPSLEY is Assistant Professor of Pastoral Theology. This meditation was delivered in Miller Chapel, October 24, 1967.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 5, No. 8

February 23, 1968

"THE ART-ARK"W. Joseph Preston

A REPORT TO THE STUDENTS OF P.T.S.
CONCERNING A ROMAN HOLIDAY.....Stanley R. Kessler

WHAT ARE WE ABOUT? J. Cameron Bigelow

DEATH OF THE OLD ONE Richard Young

PARTICIPATION IN SOMETHING OR OTHER.....Mrs. Linette Martin

THE EDITORS

Howard Happ

Andrew Woods

Theodore Atkinson

William LeMosy

Joseph Preston

Carol Moseley

George Dosier

John Mulholland

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Friday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

"THE ART-ARK"

W. Joseph Preston

"What in the world is an "art-ark?" That is what Stuart Hall is going to become for the evening of March 8, when the happening of the season will take place. This event is designed to give the members of the Seminary community a chance to express themselves in an artistic manner.

All of us have had ample opportunity to express ourselves and our feelings in the classroom, in papers, and in informal discussions. But very seldom do we get a chance to show others who we feel through artistic media. This is the purpose of this happening: to give students the opportunity of creating with their own hands, through the materials provided, expressions of their inner thoughts.

"But, I m not artistic." Nonsense! There is not a person here who hasn't at least a little spark of artistic flair in him. Why not give this spark a chance to glow, rather than keep it locked up inside you? Besides, one can never tell when he might create something of which he can justifiably be proud.

Along with the plastic arts, poetry and music, (original compositions, of course) are to be featured. This should prove every bit as interesting as the plastic arts, being, perhaps, a little less messy. Students are urged to bring already completed works; or, they may allow the aura of the evening inspire a new outflow.

If you feel creative, or, just in need of some means of alleviating some pent-up Angst, give the "art-ark" your serious consideration. Whether it is for you an enjoyable, or relaxing, or even cathartic, experience, it is guaranteed to be a welcomed (not to mention, needed) change-of-pace evening, which only you can help to create.

* * * * *

A REPORT TO THE STUDENTS OF P.T.S. CONCERNING A ROMAN HOLIDAY

Stanley K. Kessler

It was the privilege of Clarence Grant and myself to have been chosen to attend an "Ecumenical Seminar" held at the North American College in Rome during last summer and since we were at least unofficially representing you while we were there it is meet and right for us to report.

The seminar was organized by the head of the North American College, Bishop Reh, formerly Bishop of the Charleston diocese, and by the directors of the Rockefeller "Fund for Theological Education, Inc." In effect, it grew out of the book The Seminary, written by Walter Wagoner, formerly one of the directors of the Fund and now Dean of the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. The reason for the seminar was to allow Protestant and Catholic Seminarians to meet and to attempt to understand one another by living and working together for at least a period of three weeks. The seminar was actually made possible by the spirit and the documents stemming from the Vatican II Ecumenical Council (as well as the long standing Protestant concern for the unity of the Church as seen in the development of the World Council of Churches). The seminarians at the North American College felt a new blast of freedom in their school which is on a hill just a whoop and a holler from the doors of St. Peter's itself.

With this kind of atmosphere among the administration and the students of this American school in Rome, the only catch in establishing such an ecumenical seminar was how to get Protestant students to come. Here the Fund for Theological Education was a valuable ally. Not only did it have the money but it also had the facilities to contact students on several Protestant Seminary campuses (the Fund's chief function is to help a selected number of students chose a vocation by giving them a year in the seminary of their choice). The students who were finally invited to the seminar were first nominated by the president of their seminary and then screened by the Fund. Because the Fund was footing the bill for the travel to and from Rome, most of the Protestant participants nominated were former recipients of fellowships from the Fund who had remained in seminary.

The Catholic students who participated in the seminar came from the United States, from Berkeley to Brooklyn, and were encouraged to enter the North American College by the Bishops of their diocese. In the past it has been considered an honor to be selected to attend the College but now the level of dedication tends to be decisive. Once an American student finds out that he will have classes at the Gregorian University he is easily discouraged. The classes there are taught in latin. The fellows we met there were not only dedicated to Christ, if not to the Church as such, for they ask the same kinds of questions we do, but also students of a level at least as high as, if not above, that found on our campus.

The Protestant Fellows attending the seminar came from the Princeton, Harvard, Union, Yale, Lancaster, Crozer, and Episcopal (Cambridge, Mass.) Theological Seminaries. There were thirteen Protestant participants in all.

The program of the Seminar must be spoken of in two distinct aspects - the organized theological discussions and the more or less unorganized cultural and tourist activities. The theological discussions were led by Fathers Ben Meyer and Tom Stransky. Father Meyer is a member of the Society of Jesus. He received his B.A. and M.A. from Gonzaga University, Spokane, Washington. He earned the S.S.L. degree from the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome and the S.T.D. degree from the Gregorian University, also in Rome. He has contributed articles to the New Catholic Encyclopedia and was recently Assistant Professor of Scripture at the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley. His major task in the seminar was to help us struggle with the Acts of the Apostles so that we might see what it had to say about the "Theology of Christ and His Church."

Father Stransky, of the Paulist Fathers, like Fr. Meyer, received his early education in the United States. He earned the S.T.L. degree from the Catholic University of America. He later earned the L. Miss. degree from the Gregorian University after studying at the University of Muenster. He was appointed by Pope John XXIII, under Cardinal Bea, to the staff of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. He also assisted in drafting the Vatican II Decree on Ecumenism, the Declaration on Religious Freedom, and the Declaration on the Relation of the Catholic Church to the Non-Christian Religions. He has also been a Vatican observer at many of the meetings of the World Council of Churches and its commissions.

In essence, our leaders were well versed in the theology and canon law and doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church and were well qualified to speak on their topics.

Fr. Meyer met with us in the mornings and Fr. Stransky was the p.m. provoker. In the afternoons we debated and shouted and argued about such topics as "The Hierarchy of Values after Vatican II," the Decree on Ecumenism, the World Council of Churches and its statement "The Unity We Seek," Pope Paul's letter "On the Development of Peoples," Mixed Marriages, and Inter-Communion.

We also had two special sessions. One in which we were given free discussion with Msgr. Joseph Gremillion, the Secretary of the Pontifical Commission for Justice and Peace. The Commission, which is less than a year old, was established to effect social justice among nations by arousing the people of God to full awareness of their role in the world, especially in its economic development. It is also interested in the international structures for social justice with some form of world government in view. The possibility of its effectiveness can be seen in that the World Bank has invited this Commission to use its facilities in the planning of its program, short as well as long range objectives.

The other special session was with one Father Long whose chief task in his Vatican office is to seek ways in which the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches can again be drawn closer together. It was because of his discussion on the place of the Orthodox in the ecumenical movement that the seminar could at least be considered ecumenical.

The less organized part of the seminar was also of great value. Because we lived in the Villa of the North American College, located in Castel Gandolfo, it was not easy to get into Rome, about fifteen miles away. (Roman bus lines haven't been the same since Mussolini.) Nonetheless, we did have six "free" days in which we could go to the city. The gates of the Villa were to be locked at 10:30 p.m. normally, but the influx of us Protestants caused the rule to lapse and no one quibbled if we came in three hours late. Bull sessions do not respect time and there was always someone awake to let us in no matter the time. Thus many excursions were made into the city, usually under the guidance of one of the "Roman" students. They knew the language of the people, what to see and how to get there, and what to eat and where and on a student's budget. While most of us didn't exactly do as the Romans do, we did see and enjoy. Two of the organized activities in this cultural aspect of the seminar were trips to Ostia Antica, Republican Rome's bread basket, salt cellar, and port, the catacombs, and the excavations under St. Peter's basilica where the grave of an early Christian leader and martyr, perhaps Peter, has recently been found.

There are two items I must include before I close this report. The first is that we received the Pope's blessing for the seminar in the last public audience held at his summer villa in Castel Gandolfo before they realized he had a prostate problem. I don't want to belittle this experience. It is a humbling and an awe inspiring experience to shake the hand of one who represents 1900 years of church history, well maybe 17 or 18 hundred, but the second thing I wish to append is of concern for all of us.

My reason for writing this report is to ask you one question. When did you last think about the church? I don't refer to your field "experiences." I do refer to the decimated body of Christ and your membership in it. This seminar not only opened my eyes to the differences between the Roman Catholics and us but also our own Protestant decimation of that body, for whatever good reasons then, and the lack of understanding we have about ourselves. Protestants don't know what Protestants are doing, let alone the Catholics.

Upon graduation, the geographically closest people who will share your problems will be ministers in traditions other than your own. Do you know any of them? With the scores of denominations represented on our campus, do you know some of the problems and projects they have? Do you know your own Church? Do you know your own tradition? Who do we think we are that we can go around working out our own salvation and not even be acquainted with or care about the institution of which we are a part of its relation with other similar institutions. Have we no humility? Who are we to disregard the presence or the necessity of the institution or to damn it? One of the tasks of any seminarian is to know his Church and its tradition and its relation to the church. Where is our education inadequate about reality?

WHAT ARE WE ABOUT?

J. Cameron Bigelow

I want a clean cup, interrupted the Hatter, let's all move one place down.

He moved on as he spoke and the Doormouse followed him, the March Hare moved into the Doorman's place, and Alice rather unwillingly took the place of the March Hare. The Hatter was the only one who got any advantage from the change; and Alice was a good deal worse off than before, as the March Hare had just upset the milk-jug into his place.

Alice's Adventure in Wonderland

Lewis Carroll

At an ecumenical meeting of French and ENglish theological students in Montreal, in March of last year, a Roman Catholic priest made the following statement. "The danger of the ecumenical movement today is that it will resolve all the problems of the various churches and end up with a sixteenth century structure. In the meantime, the world will have passed us by." The priest was Father Gregory Baum and those words are a biting indictment of much of what is happening to the various churches in their moves to unity. What is the rationale behind the ecumenical movement today? Where does an organization like COCU fit into our understanding of Christian commitment and proper utilization of time and talents? I think we as students must become more aware of these issues, if we are going to find a meaningful place for ourselves. The aims of the ecumenical movement spring from the very heart of the Gospel. "That all may be one." As in Christ all find their roots, so in his love do the churches move together to share in his one fellowship and purpose, the spread of this Gospel throughout the world. All this sounds very fine. On the seminary campus we are naturally taught to think in such timeless phraseology. In a place like Princeton, contemplating the possibility of the one monolithic structure, the physically united church, is very conducive. Just think with what influence it could present the Word. And we think we have trouble with being part of the establishment now.

No, I am afraid we have been too easily lulled into putting all our eggs in one basket. We print a lot of nice sounding pamphlets. We actually get excited and think we have done something very special. But instead of action, we get another committee; instead of meaningful Christian involvement, we get a bastardized liturgy that takes a pinch of this and a dab of that (as is obvious to anyone who has seen the latest contribution of COCU). Today, the churches are getting hung-up trying to protect their ordination virginity. So where does that get us?

If the churches are really to be the Church of God, we must see here more as the servant of the world in the real sense of servant. Only when we are prepared to see the blood and guts issues as those that count will we get anywhere. A denomination, whatever its tradition, has a purpose. That purpose is to spread the good news of the Cataclysmic love; the love shattering greed and hatred, isolation of the individual, discrimination, vigilance over our own GNP but be damned with the nave-not nations, and everything else making us and our society less than one with Christ.

Are the churches prepared to sacrifice on this level and go out on a limb? This is where unity is to be found. Slowly, almost un-noticed, Christians of different denominations are coming together and in their common recognition of where they must serve, they find true unity. More and more the lines dividing Christians are not denominations but

"attitudinal." Theirs is a unity of real service. It is a unity respecting the various traditions but not letting these traditions get in the road of action. They will learn in action what is superficial and what is not. Perhaps in the end, they will be the remnant while we hole up in our tower protecting our \$50 million dollar funds and our \$500,000 churches. The die is cast already. If we have any insight into what is happening, then it is time more of us stood on the line. If we are so hung-up in getting caught in the institutional church, in the typical pastorate, then what are we prepared to give up to make things different? Not too long ago, a Negro minister, an advocate of black power, made a fleeting call on Princeton Seminary and dared the students of one particular class to be prepared to sacrifice their energies and even their lives to get involved where the action is, ministering out in the world. I wonder how many of us apply such a message to our own commitment to service.

"Behold, I make all things new." Maybe He is and we can't see it is happening.

* * * * *

DEATH OF THE OLD ONE

Richard Young

It was a fine day
for a funeral.
A young man quit
the chill outside,
hoping to find within the hospital-white,
colonial-colonnaded Mr. Somebody's
memorial chapel,
sepulcher-white,
warmth of HIS presence or
at least some compassion from the OTHERS.
"So few came.
What a pity!"
An order board announced
#2 service.
"Number two--again.....
I'll have a #2
with Bermuda onions
on rye
and a Bud....."
almost refreshed by his tasty fantasy,
he was slapped to his senses by the service business.
"Our Father,
 who art in heaven,
 (tiddelly pomm)
hallowed by thy name.
 (Hallowed? Really!)"

His sense of the Old One
began to die,
 gasping its last in
 prayers (thee and thou)
 approved by the Expert on
 the basis of style sacred and content orthodox in
 X many words---or less.
 First prize, a chance in the PULPIT!

How would the event look in print?

Death of the Old One

Few mourners came to worship the passing of
The Old One yesterday. Participants in the
service dressed appropriately in somber
shrouds of black, their voices belling HIS
death knell. The choir cheerfully groaned
a somewhat dirge. The deceased is survived
by students and faculty including
etc., etc., etc.

The bell
ringing coffee-time and companionship.
"John, it's good to see you.
I was just wondering,
how s your? "

Hi honey, missed you in chapel.
Get it done?
Good, And on time!
Hand it in now?"

Hands clasped
he walked her to class,
joy tingling their touch.
He felt like drawing her to him,
grasping in his arms all their peace and
pressing it between their bodies like rose petals
between the leaves of a book,
preserving it forever, but
"Not here, not now."
So they just looked and
in that glance their eyes met
and kissed.
Behold, a miracle!
Conceived in their look
was the New One;
God's presence reborn
real in the midst of their airy gaze.
Hearts caroled
"Praise God from whom all LOVE flows
among his people here below.
Praise him above your heavenly hosts--
our God is more than a Ghost."

AMEN,
amen

PARTICIPATION IN SOMETHING OR OTHER

Mrs. Linette Martin

A: He is risen!

B: Who is risen?

A: Napoleon.

B: NAPOLEON? Are you out of your mind?

A: No, I'm telling you - he is risen! Isn't that wonderful?

B: Well, er . . . oh, sure, sure. Now come over here and sit down quietly. That's right. Now begin in at the beginning, and think it through one step at a time. There's no hurry.

A: Napoleon is risen from the dead! He lives! He lives!

B: All right, I said take it quietly! Now then! How - do - you - know?

A: What?

B: How do you know?

A: Because he lives in my heart. Oh you may not understand it at first, and I'm sure that as a twentieth century man these things will sound strange to you; but the other day as I was browsing through Aesop's Fables and reality of Napoleon broke through to me in a way I have ne er experienced before. I can't express the joy and peace this knowledge has brought me ...

B: Oh that's fine, fine. I'm very happy for you.

A: Now at last I feel that I have Something to Say to Today's Man. This is the Belief that the World needs. This is the Source of Power and Unity that They have been Seeking for.

B: Why must you talk in upper case letters?

A: Some of the Best Theologians do it when they have Something to Say.

B: I see. And now you feel you have something (excuse me) Something to Say?

A: Now I can boldly proclaim the risen Napoleon.

B: And your evidence?

A: Mm?

B: Where's your evidence, your proof? HIstorical-

A: You don't understand. This has nothing to do with history. This is Belief.

B: You're a nut.

A: What?

B: I said, you're a NUT!

A: I have experienced the power of participation in the risen Napoleon. You may call me what you like, but this is beyond history, and beyond proof.

B: That's very convenient. What are you doing now?

A: Sssh. . .I'm abiding in Napoleon.

* * * * *

Quoting from the Viewpoint, Feb. 9th. (Underlinings mine): "...upon our collective ability once again to become responsible metaphysicians depends in no small measure our future as a vital community in which participation in one another's lives and in the life of Christ are live options. Do you believe that you can 'abide' in him, who has been dead nearly two millenia? What does that mean to you?"

Dr. Lapsley, it sounds as though you have turned away from the historic space-time resurrection of Jesus Christ, although considering the available evidence for it, I don't know why. But as your friendly neighborhood fundamentalist, I would like to be the first to wish you a Very Happy Easter.

* * * * *

CONTRIBUTORS

W. JOSEPH PRESTON, a veteran on the Viewpoint staff, is a senior from Clarion, Pennsylvania.

STANLEY R. KESSLER is a Senior B.D. student from Hasting, Nebraska.

J. CAMERON BIGELOW (CAM) received his undergraduate degree in 1965 from the University of Alberta, after which he attended Presbyterian College in Montreal for two years. Then, in September of 1967, he transferred to Princeton SEminary as a middler.

Viewpoint is pleased to publish another poem from RICHARD YOUNG, a senior from Yakima, Washington.

MRS LINETTE MARTIN, an English subject, is the wife of Mr. Joseph W. Martin, a special B.D. student. Mrs. Martin studied for a year in Lausanne, Switzerland.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 5, No. 9

March 8, 1968

DAILY WORSHIP AND THE STUDENTS.....	Damon D. Hickey
BEHIND THE WORSHIP ISSUE: OUR LACK OF COMMUNITY.....	Paul Derrickson
AFTER THE FUNERAL.....	Mrs. Linette Martin
OUR SECTARIAN WORSHIP.....	Howard Happ
THE SPRING THIS YEAR.....	William Wilson

THE EDITORS

Howard Happ	Andrew Woods	Theodore Atkinson	William LeMosy
Joseph Preston	Carol Moseley	George Dosier	John Mulholland

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Friday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

DAILY WORSHIP AND THE STUDENTS

Damon D. Hickey

A recent petition that has appeared on the Campus Center bulletin board requests a greater degree of student control of morning chapel services at the seminary. It contains two specific proposals: 1) that one service a week be altered to present a "guest speaker," and 2) that one service a week be experimental and be supervised entirely by students. I have signed this petition, not because I agree with its specifics (the wisdom of which I seriously question), but because I agree with its basic argument that students should have a real share in the direction of all campus-wide worship.

It may be argued that students already have such a share, since it is senior students who prepare and lead most morning chapel services, and it is students alone who plan and lead evening chapel. Now the faculty has even approved a program that permits student homilies in morning chapel. In fact, students who lead morning worship are severely limited. They are expected usually to follow one of the (rather sterile) orders given in the chapel hymnbooks. Their prayers, hymns, and Scripture selections must also be approved by our Professor of Homilectics and Liturgics, who is the designated representative of the faculty. The specifics of the petition offer little improvement over this system, since they lend themselves to a bifurcation of worship into "faculty services" and "student services," in a misguided effort to avoid exclusive faculty supervision of the total program.

There is nothing wrong, per se, with supervision, yea, even censorship of service material. Not only does it save the worshippers a great deal of pain, but it can also aid in the education of the chapel leaders. The major difficulty with the current policy is that it places all authority and responsibility on the shoulders of one man, whose judgments (however they may be presented as "suggestions") are final, subject only to a nominal review by the President in cases of extreme conflict. No matter who that one man may be, he will inevitably bear the brunt of blame for whatever anyone regards as "bad worship" or "highhandedness." It is simply bad administrative policy to put one man in such a position.

It is also bad Presbyterianism. Although our campus is not, technically, a "church" (no proper church government, highly transient membership, and so on), it may perhaps be seen as analogous to one. In a church, the direction of worship is divided between minister and session. The minister selects the hymns and Scripture lessons, preaches the sermon, and leads the prayers. All else (order of worship, properties of the sanctuary, and so on) is the responsibility of the session, which is elected by the congregation. Hence, the congregation, through its elected officers, determines the shape of its own worship (in accordance with Constitutional standards). Could not our worship be supervised by a joint faculty-student committee (for example, three teachers and three students),

elected annually in an all-campus election (with faculty also voting), with the faculty nominating its committee members and the student council nominating the student members, and with a provision for write-in candidates? If such a proposal were enacted, it should also include a provision for a limit on the number of successive terms that could be served by members, thereby approximating the salutary effects of the rotary system of elders in churches.

The committee could then determine for itself the ways in which it would handle the particulars of morning chapel, perhaps even providing for direct supervision of leaders' materials by only one of its members. The difference between this system and our present one is that 1) there would always be a review-board--the committee--in cases of conflict, 2) the delegated supervisor could not exercise his function in perpetua, since the number of terms that he could serve on the committee would be limited, and 3) chapel policy would be subject to the ultimate approval, not of a faculty that sustains one man year after year in his lonely job, but of the whole community through its yearly elections of committeemen. It might also be hoped that the resultant chapel services would be more responsive to the views and needs of the worshippers.

A final word is in order. Some may argue that the forms of Christian worship have been handed down intact from heaven, and that all talk of worship's responding to the people is putting the matter backward. The reply to this position (of which the above is obviously a caricature) is first that worship is a human act, in which men respond to God's initiative in addressing them. As a human act, it is essential that it reflect the worshippers' true response, not merely the response that the liturgists think that they ought to make. Second, although the liturgy is necessarily shaped by our concept of God's act in Christ, that concept itself changes. As our theology changes, so must our liturgy change (witness the theological and liturgical progress represented by Vatican II's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy). It seems to me that the current moves to give a larger part to students in the shaping of our worship are, or can be, signs of a healthy concern for the quality and "meaningfulness" of divine worship. It is my hope that this concern will not be frustrated.

* * * *

BEHIND THE WORSHIP ISSUE: OUR LACK OF COMMUNITY

Paul Derrickson

The discontent on campus annually seems to emerge into the open around an "issue." Usually the issue is regarded as an expression of "natural frustration" and then disregarded. But what if we take this recurring symptom seriously and ask why?

The current issue of worship is, I think, significant. Worship is based on a presupposed and shared theological system, which for us is Reformed theology. The dissatisfaction with Chapel services indicates a lack of this shared theological framework. But as Dr. Migliore has pointed

If this is so, we may ask why there are closed cliques rather than community. In theological terms, why is it we emphasize proclamation of the Word rather than listening for the Word? Does our lack of community force us to emphasize Reconciliation at the cost of Judgment? Perhaps I can offer a few tentative suggestions, which are not meant to be didactic answers, but possible approaches.

First, let us look at the structure of the way things are done around here. Faculty members are so busy keeping up with their fields that they seldom have a chance to integrate their thinking with other faculty members. It must be embarrassing for a professor to be told by a student that Dr. So-and-so is saying exactly the same things. From the students' perspective, the class load tends to create a lot of work and little chance for communication either among ourselves or with professors. For a church that does all of its work in committees, there is an appalling lack of such work in its seminary. The scarcity of seminars makes it easy to avoid defending a position - our position. And as seminarians, who tend to have dependent personalities, we do not object to the structure designed to avoid confrontation with other people or ideas.

To some extent, the structure of the seminary as it exists now is a result of an outdated educational philosophy rooted in a theology whose method is to lecture the Word which we are to apply. This is one example of our nonchalant use of the past and of our application of it to the present. But the present crisis in theology tends to bring this system and philosophy into question.

The responsibility for this situation falls equally upon us all. It will take all of us to change our lamentations into constructive actions. Our job is to build community and not to complain about its not existing. To do this we need to change structure, institutional as well as personal. Liberal and conservative cliques must give way to a community which is task-oriented and therapeutic. Within groups which force confrontation and offer support, we need to ask what is the will of God for our lives in relation to specific issues of our time. And this should not be relegated to extra-curricular activity. Then meaningful worship will be the result and not the goal.

* * * *

AFTER THE FUNERAL

Mrs. Linette Martin

You can always tell when they've been to a funeral;
Dark clothes and faces blank,
Walking to their cars with eyes low
 and not much to say.
Then they take a breath, as if to cleanse the lungs
From the smell of flowers
And formaldehyde
 And pews.

Bright things are said at last,
but still emboarrassed,
Their minds switching eagerly back
To life,

Cokes,

PTA,

The supper.

(Need to pick up some eggs on the way home.)

At first it seems irreverent, the bright store
Gleaming,

Teeming with the living.

But it must all go on,

Musn't it?

(Of course it must. Of course.)

The Old One's dead;

It took Him, it was said

An unconscionable time

A-dying.

Hisssed for a while by most of the west, and

Even the East

Could not speak ill of Him

(It isn't polite now He's dead; besides

They're really all the same, aren't they?)

Just different ways of describing

The Being.

He walked her home after the Old One's funeral.

She stripped off her scarf, shook out her hair, and stepped

Free and easy before his circled arm;

Warm.

Somewhere above them a squirrel disappeared;

A flick and a fluff, his neat claws jerking round the trunk.

Somewhere underfoot, flowers,

Small springbright in the cool green air.

She turned to him saying

"What are you?"

He smiled.

correcting her,

"Not What, but Who.

I am a man; I love you."

Her face set

quiet

shutting him out,

She forced him to define each word,

Like a brute philosopher, wanting to know why;

Not content to live content-less

reasonless

senseless.

Define, define. . .

I (Individual?)

Am (Objective existence; not a dream?

Not His dream any more, since He is

dead.)

A Man; (Chance
 Figuration of atoms,
 Born of slime
 In some far off and lifeless sea;
 Washed by the tide to bones,
 and fins and hands
 and a soul to pray
 if there were ears to hear?)
Love; (Preservation of the race,
 Without reason save that sex
 Is pleasurable
 Sometimes.) Love?

Their Old One died because He never was.
 They tore the New One prematurely from the amoral womb:
 He never lived.
 Their God - dead Cupid
 Putrifying in his crib;
 His unused arrows broken by brute facts.

Their Old One died
 Through whom all things began;
 And Man at last was free. . .
 From being a Man.

They always have to clean up after a funeral;
 Dead flowers
 Used Kleenex
 A glove
 Some tears
 Outmoded concepts: right, wrong, loveliness and "I."
 They have a lost-and-found Department
 Where little children go
 To pick among the pieces that are left.

It doesn't take long to clean up after a funeral,
 If people only knew what they were leaving
 behind.

* * * *

OUR SECTARIAN WORSHIP

Howard Happ

The signers of the recently submitted petition about morning worship show by their concern a higher estimation of worship than perhaps they themselves realize. Although they appear not to have any clear ideas about the content of worship, they put most of this campus and community to shame in their high regard for worship's unity and catholicity, for its being the expression of the whole community, not just of a faction. The petition points up the fact that worship at present is attended only

by a minority of the seminary community and that there is underlying this fact a great disagreement within the student body as to the nature of worship. The chief service of the petition, in my opinion, is to make that division clear and inescapable, and thus perhaps to move towards a reconciliation of that division within the community through theological dialogue.

If I read the signals correctly, there are many on this campus who feel that worship has no meaning whatsoever. Those who have submitted the petition, however, are plainly not among that group. Their concern to have more than a faction of the campus in chapel on at least one morning of the week, testifies to their conviction that there is meaning in the assembly of the Seminary body at a special time and within a special place. To put it another way, however the signers of the petition may differ in the way each would describe his ultimate commitment or conception of the fundamental meaning in life, they all see commitment or meaning as having as an implicate the assembling of the whole community in a special place and time. Worship is essential to their religion, and it is a worship which necessarily is expressed by the entire community; it is worship within a community necessarily one and catholic.

The primary aim of the petitioners, if I understand correctly, is to attain some form of worship which will allow the whole community to express its unity. The petition suggests that, once the group is assembled, they should do something: perhaps hear a lecture. That the action of the community should be the passive reception of a lecture says something significant about our Presbyterian tradition of worship. Nevertheless, the petition is not primarily interested in securing lecturers; its foremost concern is to find some means to bring us all together at a particular place and time. The principle action of worship is construed to consist, apparently, in our very coming together.

Many will question whether in fact this is worship. But I, for one, think that it does meet a minimum definition of "worship." Worship is at base a community's action expressing its central commitment, its conception of the fundamental meaning in life. Such an expressive corporate action necessarily takes place within a set space and time. If, for the petitioners, real meaning is expressed merely by our coming together, by making our community visible, then that coming together is in itself an act of worship. And since the expression of meaning requires the assembly of the whole community, it is catholic worship. The question remains, of course, whether it is Catholic worship, an expression of meaning through the unified assembling of the Body of Christ.

Nevertheless, the petitioners, in their concern for at least small-case catholicity, put the rest of us to shame, for most of the worship on this campus takes place in a complacent acceptance of the barriers which divide our community. Thus the worship which takes place is not catholic, and very questionably Catholic. Those who worship have not enough concern for the community or for the value of worship, apparently, to be bothered by the absence of their fellows. And those who do not worship seem, for the most part, unconcerned about either worship or the community. The petitioners bring to our attention the critical situation: this community

seems unable as one people to find a way to express its faith, or its search for a faith.

But most of us remain unconcerned, satisfied with a worship which is purely sectarian. Take, for example, a plan recently considered about evening chapel. That institution is normally attended only by a tiny handful, who are made very uncomfortable by rattling around within the spaces of a chapel designed for the worship of the community. How was it proposed to alleviate the discomfort? By withdrawing evening prayers to another place, where a certain pietistic warmth could be gained by filling a small room and concluding, "We're all here tonight." It is this tendency towards conventicles, towards a faction's defining itself as the entire community of the faithful, which reveals this seminary's sickness regarding worship.

If a tiny group finds itself alone at worship in a large chapel, that says something about worship in this community. Perhaps it says nothing profound: only that the times of morning and evening prayer are inconvenient. Or perhaps it says that the majority of the students, including those worshipping, have no theology of the Church or of worship. If that is the case, the petitioners do us a great service in pointing it out.

* * * *

THE SPRING THIS YEAR

William Wilson

The Spring this year will be,
(somehow), very different now
that we have spoken our love
in the last of the winter's fire.

I must have known in autumn,
when we first met,
that I loved you.
But, we took time for

October's friendliness to
change into November's trust
and then, mysteriously, into the
honesty of December's whiteness.

That is behind us now - that
time when roots are made -
and the Spring will be our
reward for waiting for love.

* * * *

CONTRIBUTORS

DAMON D. HICKEY, a frequent contributor to these pages, is a Senior graduate of Rice University.

PAUL DERRICKSON, best know to many as Headwaiter in the Refectory, is a middler graduate of Carleton College.

MRS. LINETTE MARTIN is the wife of a special B.D. student at the Seminary.

HOWARD HAPP is a Senior, Editor-in-chief of Viewpoint.

WILLIAM WILSON, a Junior, graduated from La Salle College, an English major.

VIEWPOINT

Vol. 5, No. 10

March 15, 1968

SPECIAL ISSUE: THE IV-D EXEMPTION

The question of the 4-D exemption from the draft is a particularly live issue today in the light of the Viet Nam war. This is an issue which touches most of us in the Seminary community in a direct and personal way.

The American Association of Theological Schools has encouraged member schools to take a stand on the question of 4-D exemption. This could lead to recommendations by the Association to the proper authorities for revision of the present law.

A committee of students and faculty appointed by President McCord has arranged this special issue of Viewpoint in preparation for an open discussion to be held on Monday, March 18, at 7:30 p.m., in the Campus Center Lounge. It is hoped that the following articles will be both informative and provocative, and will serve as a basis for the discussion.

SIX THESES ON THE QUESTION OF THE IV-D CLASSIFICATION.....	Andrew Woods
THE IV-D.....	Stewart Ellis
MINISTRY AND THE IV-D.....	Floyd Churn
A POSTSCRIPT IN REPLY TO STEWART ELLIS AND FLOYD CHURN.....	Andrew Woods
FOR THE IV-D AS AN OPTION.....	Dr. J. H. Nichols
CONSCRIPTION AND THE MINISTER.....	Dr. Arthur M. Adams
YOU AND ME AND THE IV-D.....	Larry E. Trettin

THE EDITORS

Joseph Preston

Carol Moseley

George Dosier

John Mulholland

Howard Happ

Andrew Woods

Theodore Atkinson

William LeMosy

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Friday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

SIX THESES ON THE QUESTION OF THE IV-D CLASSIFICATION

Andrew Woods

I hope that the following theses which are directed to the question of whether there should be a IV-D classification for seminarians and clergymen will contribute to the discussion of that question. I oppose our military involvement in Vietnam. Our actions there are unwise and unjust. Our national interest is to act in a way that strengthens Vietnam against Chinese expansion and supports the progressive, nationalist forces in the area; we are doing the very opposite. We should de-escalate our effort in order to lead to a withdrawal of our forces. Our present policy can be changed at this point by legal means. It can only be changed if more and more voters are persuaded that our present course is wrong. Illegal and bizarre forms of protest are not likely to achieve this aim. Though they may serve to focus public attention on the issue of the war, they are more likely to alienate the very public the protesters should be hoping to persuade. Now that my general stance has been presented, let us focus on the question of the IV-D.

1. It has been said that we should renounce our IV-D status because with it the government has "bought us off" so that we do not face the dilemma faced by other men our age. It is claimed that if we do speak out on the war we will not be heard because we are "safe." Since we are not putting ourselves in jeopardy, we are not taken seriously. There is some truth in this position, but we should remember that from a IV-D status we can speak out with a freedom and influence that is denied others. No one can seriously claim that in opposing the war we are trying to "save our own skins," that we are opposing it because we personally do not want to fight or endanger our lives. Because we are "safe," we can speak out effectively. If we do speak out, we do so as citizens who are primarily concerned for the welfare of others.

2. The argument that at present I do not have to face the moral dilemma of this war is somewhat meaningless. As a citizen of this country, I do have to face it. I am as guilty now, as I study here in Princeton, of what we are doing in Vietnam as is the man who is pulling the trigger or dropping the bombs. He is my instrument who carries out the policies of my government. As citizens we are all deeply involved. That is why the policy must be changed. I am no less guilty if I go to jail. We are no less guilty if we ourselves are not fighting. We are responsible for the policies of our government. The Greeks are not responsible for the actions of the government. The Russians are not responsible for all their government does. Our republican form of government is in constant danger, but this is still a republic. I voted for LBJ; I am represented in Congress.

3. The IV-D status serves to protect freedom of speech (particularly freedom of the pulpit). The clergy can criticize the government freely without the direct threat of being removed from their pulpits by the state and sent to the front, as they were in Germany. One of the most deplorable things about General Hershey is that he sees military service as a form of punishment. This manner of thinking is an insult to the men in military service. The thing to remember, however, is that if induction is used to stifle dissent, the IV-D status does serve to protect seminarians and clergy from suppression of their right to express their views freely.

4. As more and more graduate deferments are eliminated, the theological schools may become some of the last bastions of the "humanities" that are still able to function freely at full strength. Graduate disciplines that are not directly related to "national defense" are in trouble at the very time when our nation needs the perspective that can be offered

by the historian and the understanding of man that can be offered by the other non-scientific disciplines. Our whole society suffers if there is an imbalance between the disciplines that develop the tools of our society and the disciplines that attempt to determine how those tools are to be used for the good of man. As long as the IV-D status remains, at least one discipline that seeks to know man and give moral guidance and direction to our society is allowed to continue its efforts relatively unimpeded by the needs of this war. This is good for the whole society.

5. Freedom develops and is sustained in a society where there is a system of checks and balances that prevents one part of a government or one institution in the society from dominating. The founders of this country showed great wisdom in establishing our form of government. They showed a profound awareness of human sin and lust for power. The first amendment to the Constitution establishes the separation of Church and state for the benefit of both institutions and the whole society. Each has rights over against the other. Neither can dominate the other. The IV-D status is related to the stipulation that the Congress shall make no law "prohibiting the free exercise" of religion. An atmosphere of political freedom gradually grew in medieval Europe because of the conflict between Church and state. Each would have liked to become a tyranny, but the existence of the other constantly prevented this. The universities and traditions of academic freedom were able to develop because of the rights the Church had vis-a-vis the state. Students were classified as clergy and could not be drafted or prosecuted by the civil courts. Although this status was abused, it did much to promote academic freedom and, ultimately, freedom in the society at large. The presence of the churches today and what rights they do have serve to limit the power of the state and promote the freedom of the society as a whole.

6. We have been discussing a right that the Church has for its clergy and future clergy not to be impressed into military service against their will. In this country the government has honored that right. If the state denies that right, the church should still insist upon it and, if need be, suffer for it as it did before Constantine. Given the present situation, it would be extremely unwise and foolish for the Church to advocate the removal of the IV-D status.

* * * * *

THE IV-D

Stewart Ellis

I much appreciated Andy Woods' "Six Theses on the Question of the IV-D Classification" in the 9 February 1968 issue of Viewpoint. I frankly admit that at least half the time I find myself in his shoes and consider his theses quite appealing. However, the other half of the time I am plagued with guilt and distress about my IV-D status. So I feel I must at least raise some personal questions and give some subjective reaction to Andy's position.

1. I know from my own experience that "hiding behind the IV-D" is quite possible and perhaps even the natural thing to do. It is much easier not to read the depressing newspaper reports, not to watch the TV newscasts, not to do the digging into the Vietnam history which is necessary to have an informed position about the war. I confess that for most of my four years of seminary and internship I have allowed studies and other activities to take priority over my concern about the war and the draft. I have hidden behind my IV-D. Perhaps more than anything else, the fact that some of my friends and fellow students

were concerned enough to risk jail and separation from wives and families has jarred my cool complacency into a luke-warm complacency. I must be willing to take some risks, too, even in my confusion and uncertainty.

2. The IV-D is a privileged exemption. It bothers me that millions of young men because of family background, educational status, and economic resources have neither this privilege nor the privilege of deferment. They are unaware that there is any choice at all about the draft. Why should I have this privilege? What if I were in their shoes? Is my life of more worth than theirs?

I roomed all last year during my internship with a 22-year-old college graduate who was in an agonizing state of limbo waiting for an induction notice which to my knowledge has not yet come. Why should I be able to escape this anxiety?

Many of my wife's college friends are now separated from their husbands or have postponed marriage because their husbands or fiances had to face the draft. What makes me so special?

I cringe every time someone asks me "What will you do about the draft?" If I reply, "I don't have to serve because I am a seminary student and we are exempt," they usually answer, "Oh...you're lucky." What will I say ten years from now when people ask me the same question in the past tense? What kind of future ministry can I have with the people of my generation if I have not faced with them their most pressing existential question?

3. There is some wisdom in the idea that IV-D status protects freedom of speech. Perhaps the clergy will become the last enclave free to speak out without retribution. When and if our society and government become that closed, I doubt the IV-D will afford much protection. It seems more likely that the IV-D as an expression of church-state separation more likely leads to sterilization of the church by the state. In any case, most congregations suppress a preacher's free speech enough that the government need never worry.

Furthermore, it is sad but obvious that with few exceptions those most vocal about the war are also those who greatly question the IV-D. It seems ironic that those who reject the IV-D by and large are also those who "won't go." Why is it that those who support the war also support the IV-D? I know only one person who has renounced his IV-D and enlisted.

4. Andy's last point supports the IV-D as the church's right for its "clergy not to be impressed into military service against their will." Those for whom military service is "against their will" are provided with another option, namely, Conscientious Objection. The CO law needs to be cleaned up to include objection for reasons of conscience to a particular war and non-religious objection, but it seems a much more legitimate option for those who consider military service against their will than a blanket IV-D for clergy-men whether or not military service is against their will.

5. Finally, it seems to me that as long as the IV-D exists, if I receive it, I accept a great responsibility. Otherwise, the IV-D becomes a large liability. That responsibility is an all-out attack upon the root causes of war and a full-force effort for peace. My personal struggle with the IV-D is not yet over, but I find myself daily moving closer to CO.

MINISTRY AND THE IV-D

Floyd Churn

There is a salesman in a particular men's clothing store on Nassau Street with a remarkable memory. Although I have been in the store no more than three or four times in two and a half years, he inevitably remembers my last name - and the fact that I am a Seminary student. It is the latter that especially disturbs me, for I know that his next statement will be a reminder of the "10% Seminary Discount" awaiting me. Frankly, this is an embarrassing situation for me.

In the February 9th issue of Viewpoint, Andrew Woods set forth a defense of the IV-D Selective Service Classification for Seminary students and ministers. While it may be quite a leap from the ministerial discount to the IV-D, it seems to me that both contradict the form of ministry which is called for today. The type of ministry which sets the minister apart qualitatively from the Church, giving him special privileges and deferences, either within the Church or in society, is based upon an essentially medieval model in which the clergy in some sense stands between God and man, a model which, hopefully, is passing away. One does not have to hold to a view of ministry in which minister-laity distinctions are completely removed to recognize that the minister as a "privileged person" runs counter to a ministry in which the entire Church shares - a corporate mission. A minister should help the Church interpret its ministry, but certainly not from the sidelines. To me, this means for example, that if General Hershey is using military service as a "club," the minister should be receiving as many blows as anyone in his congregation. Thus my basic objection to the "Six Theses" is that in all of them the Church is seen predominately in terms of its clergy. In thesis #5, Mr. Woods states that "the IV-D status is related to the stipulation that the Congress shall make no law prohibiting the free exercise of religion." Yet surely it is not only the clergy who must insist upon this right, but all whose religious faith informs their conscience with respect to particular situations.

Mr. Woods believes that the IV-D gives the minister a "freedom and influence" denied others in society. In reality the minister has no more freedom than anyone else, for freedom of speech is guaranteed to everyone, and whatever limits to freedom are imposed, they are the minister's limits also (Rev. Coffin and Dr. Spock both stand accused of violating the same law). Further, society cannot bestow or deny "influence" at will - it is not such a commodity. The man sitting in jail may have as much influence as the one behind the pulpit (or, he may not). Influence is a function of how persuasively one can argue his case and/or how dramatically he can present it, not of a status conferred by society, or specifically the Selective Service System. But it does not appear that Mr. Woods is speaking here of constitutionally-guaranteed freedom; rather, he sees the minister as free of vested interests - "no one can seriously claim...we are trying to save our skins." Therefore, the threat to freedom here is not the government, but the widespread attitude in society that all who oppose a war must be "draft-dodgers," motivated by self-considerations. Now this concern to me seems to be based too much upon "what others will think" - not upon a theology of ministry. The need, then, is for patient articulation rather than reaction to anticipated charges from certain members of society. Surely it could not be alleged that clergy were acting out of self-interest if it were remembered that at one point in history, they gave up their refuge, their privileged status, to join their congregations in making difficult decisions. And hopefully the ministry will never be in such disrepute to warrant accusations that ministers are "looking out for #1." Admittedly, fine distinctions can become clouded in general societal discourse - for example, those students who are turning in their draft cards are labeled by

many as draft-dodgers, when it is that very "dodge" (a student deferment) which they are giving up; nevertheless, a decision made in response to the "pulse" of society only is not representative of the prophetic tradition of the Christian faith, a tradition quite heedless of popular opinion, nor is it based upon an adequate Christian ethic.

Finally, Mr. Woods' last thesis seems to me to push the question of the draft far beyond the IV-D question. He speaks of a "right the Church has for its clergy...not to be impressed into military service against their will." But why is this right to be reserved for clergy? Should anyone who claims to be informed in part by his conscience and who appears to be sincere be forced to take up arms against his will? If conscience acts not categorically but in response to particular situations, is not some arrangement for selective conscientious objection imperative, and should not this be the central issue which the Church places before the nation with respect to the draft?

In summary, I do not claim to have a full-blown theology of ministry, but I do believe that ministry must a) remove all vestige of a privileged-class clergy and b) be capable of transcending and negating society when necessary. The IV-D status perpetuates the first and, since it is a gift of the government (not the Spirit), absorbs most attempts to do the second. Seminary deferments are another matter, as long as the candidate is faced with service after graduation, but the "automatic exemption," from my point of view, is without foundation. This is why I feel uneasy when I think about draft cards - and Nassau Street clothing stores.

* * * * *

A POSTSCRIPT IN REPLY TO STEWART ELLIS AND FLOYD CHURN

Andrew Woods

I have been pleased to see that my "Six Theses" have served as a catalyst to bring about more discussion on the question of the IV-D classification. In this postscript I would like to reply briefly to the articles written by Stewart Ellis and Floyd Churn.

1. In response to Stewart Ellis's article, I would first like to emphasize that I am one of those who strongly oppose the war in Vietnam and yet think that there is real value in maintaining the IV-D classification.

There is a great need for a radical revision of the Selective Service laws. Some form of selective conscientious objection would be desirable, though I have real doubts about whether it is feasible.

It would be valuable to carefully study the Selective Service laws and the Congressional discussions concerning them to establish legislative intent, but it would seem that the state has assumed that seminarians and clergymen are conscientious objectors of some sort who could serve in the military as chaplains but would be expected to use arms.

I very much agree with Mr. Ellis's last point that the IV-D status gives us a greater responsibility to oppose this war and the "root causes of war." As I have tried to indicate in my theses, it also gives us an opportunity to work more freely to oppose the war. Many of us have already been "drafted," drafted into the service of the Lord of all. In that service we can work to change the present policies of our government which are rooted in the ideological "hang-ups" of many of our people. There is much we can do within the

Church to show our people that our present policy is immoral, un-American, and self-defeating.

2. In response to Floyd Churn's article I would like to clarify my view of the Church and the ministry. Though the "Six Theses" may give the impression that I see the Church "predominately in terms of its clergy" because I am focusing on the position of the clergy, such an impression is not accurate. The Church is a body of people with various gifts and functions. All are ministers. The ordained ministry is most properly seen in a functional way. Certain members of the Church are set apart by the Church to preach, teach, administer the sacraments, and serve as leaders within the Body of Christ.

The Bill of Rights is related to IV-D in that the functions performed by the clergy are essential to the "free exercise of religion." A group trying to prohibit the "free exercise" of religion would try to remove ministers from their pulpits. One of the best ways to try to eliminate a group as an effective force is to attempt to "pick-off" its leaders. Mr. Churn is quite right in stressing that all are protected by the First Amendment prohibition.

I do not favor obeying the "pulse" of society or letting the climate of opinion determine how or whether the Church speaks out or not. The Church is called to speak out in a prophetic way, but being attune to the attitudes of society is important in any effort at communication or persuasion.

In my last thesis I am not saying that the clergy alone have a right to not have to take up arms against their will; there should be consideration for conscientious objectors, and that category should probably be broadened. But the Church as Church has certain rights which it should insist upon within society. Perhaps we can learn some things from the Medieval Church or from Calvin's efforts to maintain Church freedom at Geneva. The Church is not to be served by the society or be in a position of special privilege. It is called to serve, and in serving it will suffer. But it can insist upon a certain recognition of its place in the world.

I see the IV-D as something that does not so much favor the clergy as it does the Church and the society as a whole. The Church is, indeed, often called to say "no" to the society and the false gods of this world. I cannot, however, see how the Church can "transcend" society. The Church is always part of the world even when it is most perfectly fulfilling its task of being a "light" to the world.

We need a broader perspective than our own unease or guilt about our IV-D status. We are called to serve Christ in the Church and the world. We can better serve the Church by functioning within it; we can better serve the world by actively seeking, in our various ways, to change our present disastrous policies.

There is need for draft reform, though IV-D should be maintained. The question of IV-D is an important one because it brings up the problem of our identity as ministers and the role of all the people of the Church in the world. But opposition to the war through trying to persuade the American people of the error of our policies should be our primary concern at this time.

* * * * *

FOR THE IV-D AS AN OPTION

Dr. J. H. Nichols

Andrew Woods' theses in support of the IV-D classification seem to me, on the whole, substantial and well-taken. The question is not that of conscientious objection to war,

or to this war (which is a highly important, but separable issue). The question is whether or not the church should claim, and the state accord, exemption for ministers and seminarians on the grounds of their ministerial function. I would agree with Andrew Woods that it would be unwise for either church or state to eliminate this option.

Most of the 19th and 20th century controversies over the issue were occasioned by governments' drafting priests and ministers as a punitive action against the church, as in France in World War I, and with the Nazis in World War II, and by various communist governments. The power to conscript, like the power to tax, is a formidable weapon for an anti-clerical or anti-Christian state out to cripple or destroy the church. Roman Catholic experience of such attacks has undoubtedly firmed the determination of that church to insist on ministerial exemption, and Roman Catholic pressure probably explains much recent American policy on the matter.

American Protestants have been less of one mind on this issue. In the second World War, and even more extensively today, protest has rather come from the opposite direction, from ministers and seminarians who wished to waive their ministerial exemption in order to register conscientious objection to military service. A number of Protestant seminarians and ministers served prison terms in the 1940's for refusing to register under the draft law. This was their way of declaring their conscientious objection. If they had registered, they would have been classified IV-D and denied the possibility of conscientious objection. The intent of the contemporary draft-card burners among seminarians, as I take it, is very similar, except that the objection is usually to this particular war, rather than to military service in general.

New government regulations may go far to solve this problem. As reported in the New York Times they will permit ministers and seminarians to be exempted if they request IV-D classification, but that classification will apparently not be given automatically, as heretofore. This opens the option of conscientious objection to the ministerial candidate, beside those of military service and of ministerial exemption. The definition of conscientious objection remains too restricted, in my judgment, but at least the ministerial C.O. is put on the same footing as the lay C.O. If ministers and seminarians apply for IV-D henceforth they must do so on the basis of a personal decision.

As one who accepted such a classification only with great hesitation years ago, but who has come to think more of it since, I would argue that there are good reasons for ministerial exemptions as such. The Roman Catholics have been clear that priests should not fight. Should one who is set aside to divide rightly the Word of God and to administer the Holy Supper be called upon also to handle the grenade and the flame-thrower? It is perfectly legitimate for a Christian layman to be a policeman, a judge, an insurance salesman, a brewer, a union organizer, a bomber pilot, but I question whether any of these roles can be combined with those of a minister without serious impediment to his ministerial task.

Much of the contemporary stress on the mission of the church to the world tends to blur the distinctive role of the minister. I would argue that witness and service to the world is indeed the task of the church, but primarily the calling of the laymen. The function of the minister, by contrast, is primarily that of nurturing and equipping the laymen to serve the world. It is the ministers who have the major responsibility of interpreting the Scripture and tradition in usable form, of pastoral care and Christian nurture, of leadership in worship, of the up-building and disturbing of the congregations of laymen. I doubt if this vocation is compatible with much political or military activity.

(In this connection I would register one demurrer against Andrew Woods' association of freedom of speech primarily with the pulpit. I doubt whether the pulpit is the proper place for a minister to present his more controversial views on public affairs. He has many

other avenues of expression open to him where he will not take unfair advantage of those who conscientiously disagree with him.)

One might argue that war is a temporary interruption of normal functions of all sorts. I would like to think that is true today, but I do not yet see the de Gualle who will extricate us from our Asian Algeria. The present likelihood is that war is to be the indefinite expectation. We must in any case consider the intrinsic compatibility of functions and vocations.

Several contributors to the Viewpoint debate have expressed a sense of guilt that others are bearing the burden of the war. The feeling is justified. Some guilt is often also felt by those (usually a large majority) who go into service and never see action. As one of the generation who fought World War II, I have lived for decades with a sense of guilt for not paying my share of the price then. But a sense of guilt is not sufficient grounds for setting a policy. And I do not honestly think that the fact of my exemption in the 1940's has perceptibly limited the effectiveness of my ministry since, with veterans or otherwise. If I were a lawyer or aspired to political office or something requiring a security clearance, my record might limit my usefulness; as a minister I do not think it has. The vocation of a minister involves certain renunciations, especially political and financial, and entails distinctive responsibilities which are not easily compatible with military service.

To describe this as a "vestige of a privileged class" seems to me unnecessarily perjorative. Differences of vocation are not necessarily to be set in a hierarchy of privilege or status. I doubt if the ministry is sufficiently "privileged" to make this a problem. We do not see throngs of worldlings pressing into ecclesiastical sinecures. Clergy fares on the railroads or discounts at Bamberger's are rather ambiguous "privileges." It is possible, of course, that some with no serious vocation or interest may seek refuge from the draft in seminaries. But there are screening devices, and this problem can probably be handled more or less satisfactorily.

From the point of view of both the church and American society I think the reason for permitting ministers and seminarians to apply for exemption on the ground of their function and calling are sufficient.

* * * * *

CONSCRIPTION AND THE MINISTER

Arthur M. Adams

Conscription is repugnant to those who love freedom. It may be eliminated only by the abolition of war and the threat of war or by a different method of securing military personnel. The abolition of war would be the ideal solution but appears to be beyond our reach. A different method of securing military personnel is not. One obvious alternative is a volunteer force. This has the virtues of (1) preserving individual freedom, (2) furnishing the military leaders with a force in which high morale can be assumed, and (3) placing upon the nation's elected leadership a restraint which would oblige them to avoid unpopular military involvements. A difficulty with this plan is that it is expensive: enlisted men would have to be paid higher salaries than at present. This would add some billions of dollars to our annual expenditures for military activity, but the increased payment to the rank and file of soldiers and sailors would be fairer, and the price-tag on freedom is always high. We ought to work for a voluntary military establishment, but in the meanwhile we must live with conscription.

Those who design a system of conscription for a modern industrial state must keep in mind that in addition to providing an adequate supply of men for military service, the system must so far as possible function without disrupting the nation's life or reducing its future effectiveness. This involves some plan of exemptions and deferments for those engaged in essential functions or preparing to perform them. The scope of the functions classified "essential" will contract as military danger increases, but when the danger is limited the list will be large. A rational system of conscription will balance the need of the military for intelligent and capable men with the need to preserve the largest possible number of gifted persons and persons engaged in essential activities for the benefit of all the people now and in the nation's future. This appears to be grossly unfair to less gifted persons or those engaged in occupations not considered essential, but granted that a conscription system is established, it is plainly absurd for a nation to risk inducting into its armed services a potential Einstein or Salk rather than a man of ordinary ability, and even when the difference is less marked it is reasonable to take cognizance of it if it can be clearly established. Furthermore, if one can identify essential services requiring special preparation and experience, it is entirely reasonable to exempt those engaged in these enterprises.

In the U.S., Congress has defined the essential functions and the preparatory activities which constitute bases for exemptions and deferments. Included are farming of particular kinds, medicine, and technical operations for which long preparation is necessary. Also included is the ordained ministry. This provision is based on the assumption that ministers and rabbis perform an indispensable function for the people of the nation. Viewed from the perspective of the state they build foundations for character and values without which any society will disintegrate. While churches and their leaders have enjoyed limited success in this enterprise most communities would be poorer without them.

An irony of the present situation is that the representatives of a majority of persons in the nation place a higher value on the office or function of ministry than many of the ministers themselves. It may be that the legislators exalt the task for the wrong reasons. It may be that a number of ministers are right in concluding that they do not perform essential services. The fact is that upon both sociological and theological grounds a case may be developed for the ministry as an essential service.

If a minister or a man preparing for the ministry believes that it is not a unique vocation of "life and death" importance, if he thinks of it as just one more helping profession, he will quite properly insist that there should be no draft exemptions for ministers and if he is consistent he will waive his own exemption.

If he accepts his exemption as a rational aspect of the conscription law, he may still be convinced that in his own particular case his ministry will be more effective in the long-run if he serves in military ranks, or if he enlists as a chaplain. On the other hand he may feel that he is called to a different form of ministry. If he is a conscientious objector to war, the minister or candidate for the ministry must decide whether to accept his ministerial exemption and work against war as opportunities are afforded, or to recounce his exemption, ask for conscientious objector status, and be assigned to "work of national importance." If he believes that his ministry is of more importance than any assignment he is likely to receive, there is not much point in seeking a different assignment by a circuitous route.

If he is not a conscientious objector to war but objects to participation in a particular war on conscientious grounds he may (1) accept his exemption on the ground that it is a rational recognition of the importance of his vocation and proceed to work at his task while doing all that he can to end the war, or (2) waive his exemption whether or not he

thinks it justified, refuse to be inducted, and submit to imprisonment on the ground that this is the best way to fight against the unjust war. In this circumstance the choice between acceptance or refusal of exemption may be determined (1) by his willingness or unwillingness to confine his ministry to one issue, (2) by his estimate of the expediency of the alternate courses in achieving the desired end of the war, (3) by his feeling that the best way to exercise his ministry in a particular context is to join his fellows who cannot have exemptions, (4) by the relative weight he assigns to law and the democratic processes on the one side and private conscience on the other.

Remembering the Nuremberg trials we wish our government would provide lawful ways of dissent from particular wars or specific commands in military action. At the same time we are aware that military activity would be virtually impossible if an officer could not tell whether his troops would obey a particular order and the Congress could not determine in advance whether a declaration or war would be supported. The logic of the demand for freedom of choice in these matters appears to lead inescapably to pacificism. But tyranny in some forms is known to be so intolerable that few are ready to commit themselves to this course. This leaves us face to face with agonizing choices in which one may help his neighbor to clarify issues, but can only make choices for himself.

* * * * *

YOU AND ME AND THE IV-D

Larry E. Trettin

Let me begin by quoting from a document, "Channeling," until recently part of a Selective Service "Orientation Kit":

The meaning of the word 'service'...is certain to become widened much more in the future. This brings with it the ever increasing problem of how to control effectively the service of individuals who are not in the armed forces.

...The club of induction has been used to drive out of areas considered to be less important to the areas of greater importance in which deferments are given, the individuals who did not or could not participate in activities which were considered essential to the defense of the Nation.

Throughout his career as a student, the pressure---the threat of loss of deferment---continues....The loss of deferred status is the consequence for the individual who has acquired the skill and either does not use it or uses it in a nonessential activity.

The psychology of granting wide choice under pressure to take action is the American or indirect way of achieving what is done by direction in foreign countries where choice is not permitted.

Selective Service processes do not compel people by edict as in foreign systems to enter pursuits having to do with the essentiality and progress. They go because they know that by going they will be deferred.

This approach (the "American" way) seems no more commendable than other systems of "choiceless" conscription and may, in fact, be more contemptible due to its hypocrisy.

Now let me quote from Andrew Woods' article of Feb. 9th, adding three qualifying adjectives reflecting the sense of the quotation above and my personal bias:

We should remember that from a IV-D status we can speak out of a [privileged] freedom and [questionable] influence that is [unrightfully] denied others.

These additions point out the nature of my disagreement with Mr. Woods. Without them the IV-D, based on the assumption that the work of the clergy is squarely in the "National interest" (not a "check" as Mr. Woods intimates), is argued to be justifiable. With them, the deferred status is seen to be special, granted in accordance with the theory of "channeling" (not out of respect for Church-State separation) to keep the recipients passified and, consequently, influentially impotent (i.e., because there is no relation between Church and State, the Church should "keep its opinions to itself," "stick to religion," not "mix religion and politics," etc.).

We know and are thankful that this doesn't work in all cases. People like Mr. Woods do speak out and do become actively involved in the decision-making process, in spite of the fact that he and most of us only have the opportunity to react to established policies (like those which enable the Vietnam "war" to be perpetuated). But it is undeniable that those who do actively involve themselves are in the minority. The deferment has effectively reinforced the traditional distinction between "political" and "religious" concerns. It has, further, been a leading factor in the all-too-evident fragmentation of "ethical" decision-making to the extent that today we are reluctant to make any moral judgment regarding other than "church" goings-on. The deferment has played a significant part in separating religion, not only from politics, but from life in the world. All moral decisions must now be made in some religious vacuum having nothing to do with social, psychological, and especially "political" realities. (Or did I mis-read Dr. Hendry's remarks in the Feb. 9th Viewpoint?) Let's end the deferment and face life!

CONTRIBUTORS

ANDREW WOODS, member of the Viewpoint editorial staff, appears again with his article from the February 9, 1968, issue and a reply (to the two included rebuttals) which the Editors thought important for the theme of this issue.

STEWART ELLIS, a Senior B.D. candidate, is a graduate of Wabash College. He served as an intern last year in Atlanta, Georgia.

FLOYD CHURN is a senior, a graduate of the University of Richmond.

DR. J. H. NICHOLS is Professor of Modern European Church History.

DR. ARTHUR M. ADAMS is Dean of the Seminary and of Field Education.

LARRY E. TRETTIN is a senior, a graduate of San Francisco State College.

VIEWPOINT

Vol 5. No. 11

March 29, 1968

A CALL TO THE MINISTRY RECONSIDERED.....Bill Larkin
POEMS FROM RURAL GEORGIA.....James E. Roghair
HOMILY DELIVERED IN MILLER CHAPEL.....Dr. Charles West
PERPETUAL O'CLOCK NEWS and THIS WEEK OF SPRINGDan Dingfield
THE VIETNAM DEBATE ON CAMPUS: SOME REFLECTIONS.....Bill Carr
I BELIEVE IN YOUR RIGHT TO EXPRESS YOURSELF,
AND I SHALL DEFEND THAT RIGHT UP TO YOUR DEATH
OR
DEAR ALICE.....James S. Crawford

THE EDITORS

Howard Happ	Andrew Woods	Theodore Atkinson	William LeMosy
Joseph Preston	Carol Moseley	George Dosier	John Mulholland

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Friday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

A CALL TO THE MINISTRY RECONSIDERED

Bill Larkin

Some recent viewpoint articles have dealt with the question: "Why am I here?" The confusion is engendered by an incomplete perspective on our institutional and personal experience. We lack a realistic concept of the necessity of a call to the gospel ministry. By a call is meant a knowingness in the individual that God has chosen him to minister to the needs of the church and the world in the lifelong proclamation of the gospel. The contention of this article is that the very nature of ministry and the gospel demands such a call.

Laying aside a consideration of the various forms it might take, the ministry is characterized by expendability. The individual has committed himself to Christ as his Savior and Lord to minister, be a servant, for Him. The task's extent is not determined by the servant but by His Lord. The servant has responded to the call of His Lord to the task in obedience from the first. He has reckoned his own will and desires dead, but himself alive to ministry in Christ.

Not only his response but the very idea of a call implies a position of subordination for the individual called. I am called by God. Not of my own will, in the final analysis, do I enter into the ministry. God Himself has made the decision for me. He has chosen me yet left me free to respond.

Knowledge of a call such as this creates a mind-set in us which enable us to take up this task of ministry effectively. It gives us the confidence and courage to persevere in a task whose reinforcement from others is nil and even negative at times. Yet, it keeps us from a stubborn, self-righteous martyr-complex. We realize that it is God, not ourselves, who has called us to serve.

For the minister, expendability is complete. Not only does the task demand total involvement without guaranteed response, but the task by its very nature is self-liquidating. The minister purposes to work himself out of a job by building up the faith of his people to the end that they will minister in building up others. As a teacher of teachers he becomes expendable. The role itself provides no continuity of security. Only his call is there to give him the orientation and motivation, which makes him glad to hear his congregation, adequate in Christian maturity, say, "We don't need you anymore."

The nature of the message we have as ministers of the gospel demands a call. The gospel, the good news that the saving grace of Christ's death and resurrection is freely offered to all who respond to it in faith, is good in contrast to a very bad situation: mankind's sinful alienation from God. Paul's constraining urgency in II Corinthians 5 is based in the same awareness, "if one died for all, then were all dead." This life and death character of the presentation of the gospel demands unswerving purpose in proclamation and a tireless urgency to communicate it as effectively as possible. These cannot come without a call. Realistically, no man will of his own accord meet these demands. The love of Christ must constrain us to be those messengers of reconciliation. God's grace must come to compel us to plead with mankind, which is quite content to ostracize us or buy us off with intellectual respectability just so we won't talk about the gospel in life and death terms.

The gospel also demands a call in order that we may be able to give it in love. If our ministry were our own doing, the message would be nothing more than, "I have

the answer and am I not going to tell you about it." Rather the attitude of those called is that the gospel is a treasure mysteriously placed in us earthen vessels. In D. T. Niles' words, the ministry is simply "one beggar telling another where to find bread." How would the first know and be compelled to tell unless he had been called and given the compulsion to speak? How would the second know that the bread was truly a gift from God and the message a witness to His power unless the first be called and give credit only to God.

These theological considerations must be applied to some opinions currently on campus. At lunch and dinner periodically I hear a discussion of criteria for the "job" one will get after seminary. "The higher the class rank, the higher the salary...Don't go into teaching. Pay advance is quicker in the pastorate...It's a crime, my wife could be making more teaching than I would at my initial parish." (I would hasten to interpose a clarification. These sample comments are intended to reflect a preoccupation with and not the necessary concern for financial security.) The question now comes: "How do we honestly reconcile such a preoccupation with all these things added to us with a call to be servants?" For the called one the terms of the contract are set by a Christ who promises persecution and abandonment. All one has is the promise of His presence and enablement. "He who calls you is faithful, and he will do it."

* * * * *

POEMS FROM RURAL GEORGIA

James E. Roghair

Would the race might wake
from centuries of nightmare
to love.

But

Embittered by years Black
contentedly smiles with no contentment,
"yes sir" by habit "all right."

While

Fearful lest precious White
pinnacles topple as niggers emerge men,
they're shouting.

A shattered family under one sun or rain,
eating around one table,
where none speaks or listens.

How can it be so many miles across the table?
or light-years to the house next door?
In minutes jets orbit, diminishing the globe,
yet ground miles are long,
and heart miles even longer.

Hoping, I pray
for diminishing miles
love's miracle.

THE LIVING

Nameless to me
A father and mother
Surrounded by a handful of kin.

A small girl laughed--
What else could she do?
Though nothing was funny.

All were quiet--a scripture, a prayer--
A service too simple in the dingy room.
And what could they hear?
God may be white,
But why a white preacher?

Quietly spoken--all was soon finished--
A crumpled leaf symbolized
"Dust to dust."

Singly they filed by.
From where I stood it might have been a doll
Lifeless in the tiny pine box.

She cried.
Nearly a long year of her life
Lay in the tiny pine box.

Weakly running
To take her last look.

"How could it happen?"
Sobbed without syllable.
His gentle rough arm bringing little comfort
To the frail shoulder.

But what could I say?
And I went home.

* * * * *

HOMILY DELIVERED IN MILLER CHAPEL
November 7, 1967

Dr. Charles West

Romans 12:1-5

What is the form, what is the structure and style, of the life we are called to live?

Put in other words, what is the law of God, by which all things hold together and make a meaningful pattern? What is the structure which shows us where we belong in this world and where we ought to go?

This is our dilemma, is it not? We live in a world where the structures are breaking down. It wasn't long ago that most of us lived in a universe where the majesty of God's eternal judgment was the first and most powerful fact with which we had to reckon. Not only Luther lived in such a world. So did Shakespeare. So did Sir Isaac Newton. So did many of our own fathers and mothers. The structure of the law was clear. So were its rewards and punishments. But today that framework is simply no longer around us. The power of man is too obviously great. That God, that hypothesis, is no longer necessary.

It wasn't long ago that we knew where our society was going. Through a precarious but responsible and restrained use of power in world affairs we were slowly bringing peace on earth. A few nuclear weapons agreements appeared. Communists softened and entered dialogue and trade agreements. At home we were realizing the dream of a just and integrated society, without poverty, without humiliation and without hate. We knew and we still know, what the form of that society should be. But today we are tearing apart a country ten thousand miles away in a display of hopeless power, and with no peace in sight. And at home, when the chips are down, we face the brutal, immovable structure of white power and the black man's effort to counter it, while in Congress the anti-poverty program is being strangled.

It wasn't long ago that we knew what the Church was and how its form played a role in the structure of the world. The role of the minister was an honorable one and it was clear and meaningful. There were definite patterns of family and personal religious life around which Christian life cohered. We know what a seminary was for, and how Greek, Hebrew, exegesis, church history, doctrine and homiletics made one sound and powerful pattern. I don't have to enlarge before this congregation, on what has happened to this structure.

What form does the rule of God take today? What is the structure of our world which gives us confidence and hope in taking part in it? What is the pattern of the Church and of the Christian life in which we can be secure?

We have lost our sense of the forms. Paul, in another passage puts it even more clearly than here. "While we are at home in the body, we are away from the Lord, for we walk by faith and not by sight." But the word for "sight" is eidos - from it we get the word ideal, idea, and ideology. We are away from the form which would give us a clear direction, and a secure place. For Paul this was a cause to be of good courage, but for us, it is our predicament. And not only ours, also that of our whole modern world.

Where do we turn in this situation? Our text suggests three steps.

1. First, "present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God." This means our whole selves. The word for body, soma, and the word for soul, psyche, were often interchangeable in the New Testament. Both of them represented the Hebrew word soul which meant the entire person in this world. Present, in other words, what you are. This means not your eidos, not your picture of what you ought to be or what you hope to become. Not your reputation for scholarly accomplishment, not your 1.5 average, not the rounded pastor, teacher or revolutionary you expect to become, but yourself whatever you are. The material of the sacrifice is far less important than the fact of it. We are not in seminary to seek our self-identity, to discover our role and build up our reputation in the structure of the church, but by the mercies of God to present and sacrifice and get beyond ourselves. To take as a calling and a hope the loss of form which has been forced upon us by the world--this is holiness. This is our logiken latreian, our ~~reasonable~~ service.

2. "Be not conformed to this age but be transformed by the renewal of your mind that you may prove what is the will of God."

According to what discipline are we to bring ourselves as a living sacrifice? There are a good many patterns of this age. We find them both inside and outside the church. They call us to responsible service and they offer us important rewards. There is the pattern of the pastoral counselor with the compensations of being needed by many people. There is the great preacher, the master of elocution, style, and homiletic technique. There is the expert in community affairs who proves the worth of his ordination by his contribution to civic improvement. There is the revolutionary who proves his faith by the "no" he says to the system. But the patterns of this age--and there are many more of them--are each forms which fail to recapture the structure we have lost. We must have our ideals, but we as Christian believers know explicitly what the world knows implicitly--that these forms are not as eternal as they seem and therefore they are not as relevant to the need of the age.

"Be transformed by the renewal of your mind." There is an inherent weakness in the life of Christians, a weakness to which we are called. We must live in and through the forms which are offered us, and yet we are obliged to seek the transforming direction in which the world is moving. We should be on the firing line when an issue is drawn, but we are undependable soldiers because we see the front differently from those beside whom we fight. It runs through each of us. The counselor must seek help. The preacher must listen and stumble at what he hears. The social expert is disarmed when he discerns whose interest he is serving. The revolutionary cannot forget his own need to be forgiven for his awful righteousness, and to forgive his enemies. This weakness, too, is our reasonable service.

3. "For by the grace given to me I bid every one among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think but to think with sober judgment each according to the measure of faith which God has assigned him. For as in one body we have many members and all the members do not have the same function, so we, though many, are one body in Christ, and individually members of one another."

There is a form after all. It is very much a secular form, a reality of the incarnation and therefore of this world - the form of the body of Christ. Here we find our self-identity after all, not as selves but as members of one another whose very sense of what it means to be ourselves is mutually dependent. The form of this body is the form of the servant, the form of sacrifice and the form of hope. It is a transforming form--not an institution but an event which is happening to us and to the world, a relation which holds us while it remakes us all. For most of us this is the most disturbing realization of all. Nothing is sacred, nothing is ideal. The very force which holds us together judges our every effort to define that unity in our terms. Our ideas of the controlling center - this chapel service, our scholarly discipline, our concept of the pastoral office, our conception of radical community - are always being questioned, even undermined, by the faith and work of other members, and yet we cannot cut them off. They too are somehow, part of the body. A theological seminary, a Church of Jesus Christ, is an intensification of all the conflicts of the world, because the option of breaking the relation with some of our enemies, is not open to us anymore. Instead we are called to find ourselves - with all that we passionately believe - as members of one another in a body whose head is always redefining and redirecting what we are. This is the chance we take when we call ourselves Christians, and this is the hope we share.

PERPETUAL O'CLOCK NEWS

Dan Dingfield

...and on the national news front today
 it is reported that green george washington has
 a psycho-genic ulcer...informed medical
 sources say that the combination of
 a napalm diet and an unfulfilled desire
 to be held may result in his ultimate devaluation.

THIS WEEK OF SPRING

the windstream of youth
 careless it was,
 hair and joy bolwing from my
 american flyer wagon
 as the fly on a summer window
 but now...
 i rise naked to the Absolute
 in the grey fog dawn
 and i see...
 ...see democracy's ice base melting
 soon to drown but...(mother said american protestant God
 would uphold all)...
 and now i cry to the mirror
 for a glimpse of my wagon
 and i hear
 with my eyes on
 channel five of my mind's ear
 the death rasp from the
 sepulchre of america...
 from the vise my soul vomits a strictured cry,
 for the hollow rattle of
 enshrouding contradictions
 infects me, makes the worm
 my partner..
 and i'll never get my kite
 off this earth again.

* * * * *

THE VIETNAM DEBATE ON CAMPUS: SOME REFLECTIONS

Bill Carr

Quite some time ago, an anonymous opinion statement appeared on several seminary bulletin boards to which a reply must be made. The statement included a recent newspaper account of the murders of several Christian missionaries by the Viet Cong during the recent offensives in South Vietnam. The statement itself goes on to criticize members of the Princeton Seminary community who went to our nation's capital on February 5th and 6th to participate in the Conference of Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam and asks that criticism and opposition to the United States war effort cease

and be replaced by criticism of the Viet Cong.

This statement is an utter distortion of the reality of the nature of the United States' involvement in the war; it throws our responsibility as citizens to our country and to the people of Vietnam into awful disproportion. These and other murders by the Viet Cong would not be denied by those who oppose our government's policies in Vietnam; the fact of the Viet Cong's horrible atrocities must be recognized, as must those atrocities committed by the United States' military forces. But the issue is not the relative degree of guilt of the Viet Cong or of the United States in committing atrocious acts; rather, it is the responsibility that we bear for our own mistakes and wrong deeds. How can the richest, most powerful nation on earth possibly be absolved of its responsibility for a massive military offensive by the fact that the armed forces of a small, underdeveloped nation commit acts of atrocious violence? The person who authored the statement in question did so, no doubt, out of genuine compassion for the victims of this violence, but I would urge him to look again at the sources of the Christian faith out of which he desires to speak. In the Sermon on the Mount our Lord admonishes us: "Why do you see the speck that is in your brother's eye, but do not notice the log that is in your own eye?...You hypocrite, first take the log out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your brother's eye." (Matthew 7:3,5) Our nation is responsible and guilty, not innocent and righteous. We are the ones who have a log in our own eye, and it must be our first responsibility and priority to remove it.

The spirit in which the opinion statement is presented is also unfortunate. It seeks to destroy those whom it criticizes rather than to support, set free, and bring them to a fuller life. The statement does not respect the integrity of those persons with whom it differs; it uses derogatory language, and its author is not identified. If the author has insights into the complexities and ambiguities of our nation's Vietnam policies, it would enhance the possibilities for learning and coming to greater clarity if they were offered openly and in a spirit of trust and of love for other members of the seminary community. As it is, the reactive nature of the statement only tends to elicit further reactions from those who read it. I hope that in the future the author of the anonymous document will find enough personal support and encouragement from the rest of us, his fellow students, to enter openly into the discussion of this issue. From the tone of this opinion statement, one can hardly help but be skeptical about the possibility of a modern-day secular man's finding the same quality of relationship which was found among those of whom a pagan of the first Christian centuries observed, "Behold, how these Christians love one another!"

* * * * *

I BELIEVE IN YOUR RIGHT TO EXPRESS YOURSELF,
AND I SHALL DEFEND THAT RIGHT UP TO YOUR VERY DEATH."

OR

DEAR ALICE

James S. Crawford

There seems to be a fad these days that involves good old-fashioned liberal idealism couched in revolutionary rhetoric. It seems best hidden, or perhaps camouflaged, by the one word "radical." It shows up in such ideas as the "Black Revolution," the "radical community," the "free university," and other such absurd appellations.

Let's face a few facts. In the first place I think that we would agree that the

world is facing at least a mild crisis. Perhaps, as Mario Savio has said, the powers that be believe that we have come to "the end of history," and so their vision has failed. Then again, perhaps we have come to the end of history. If we are simply at an end to vision, then there are still two basic ways to change things: reform, and revolution.

Social reform is the good old-fashioned American method which says that the problem resides in the ways things are being administered. It is the backbone of "American Liberalism," best exemplified by such things as A.D.A., Y.A.D., the Socialist Party, the Conservative Party, motherhood, apple pie, social work, and other of this ilk. It is the belief that the basic structure of a society is sound: "The ideal is still realizable if only 'we' can come to power."

Revolution is something else. Social revolution has to do with an understanding and total renunciation of the entire structure and fabric of a given social system. It involves a commitment to overthrow and replace that vestigial structure by any means possible. It is an irrevocable commitment which ends only in either death or victory. It is a way of life, and a way of death. It may be the only tragic death left to man.

Radical is a word that I don't think I can define. (Aside from everything else, the world's present state is also destroying the effectiveness of our language.) It appears to be an alternative for those who have spent years, or perhaps days, talking about how worthless "American Liberalism" has been; how "bad" the social system is; how much better things could be if only... Need I say it?

There are only a very few people who have made the irrevocable commitment to changing the fabric and structure of our social system no matter what the cost. I've seen none among my fellow-students here. Rather what I have seen is the latest generation of liberals who like to think of themselves as radicals or even revolutionaries. We have no Gueveras or Debrays ready to confront the long quiet forces of the last generation's revolutionaries, but rather we do have a great many who, like Juan Bosch, find themselves classed as revolutionary elements only because their moderately progressive ideas are thrown up against the intellectual void of the reactionary system in which we live.

Both reform and revolution have brought about change. We are, at least nominally, Christians, and whether we are involved in reform or revolution as Christians we have accepted an irrevocable commitment. There is no shame to that which we call "liberalism," but there is shame in turning your back on your commitment. Revolution makes the commitment for you: when you're shooting at someone either you keep shooting or get shot! Reform movements have often been rightfully criticized because the participants have been known to change horses in mid-mud. That is the failure of the individual (in us it is the failure of our Christian faith) but not the inherent failure of the method he chose. This inability to admit what we are can lead only to frustration, and probably failure.

There is a great deal of talk about a "Black Revolution." I don't think there is any such animal. There is very obviously a movement, rooted in an apparent commitment to "change at any cost," which is happening. Revolution? No! It is a movement for reform which, from frustration, has resorted to violence. "Black Power," in even the most militant forms that I have seen, is not looking for a change in the total structure and fabric of American society. (Karenga may be an exception.) "Black Power" is an attempt to realize the "American Dream" by the Afro-American people. (They haven't named the next victim, they only know it's time for a change.)

For example, when was the last time you heard a "Black Power" militant talk about the redistribution and equalization of our country's wealth? You have heard demands for the "Black man's share" in this system. I haven't heard too many people calling for common ownership of the means of production (except Walter Reuther, and he was careful to couch that demand in liberal rhetoric!) I am waiting to hear a proposal for a coalition between the National Farmers' Organization and the starving thousands in our cities. (And while you're up, tell me if the classless society is going to operate with or without bureaucracy?)

Neither Stokely Carmichael nor Hubert (Rap) Brown threatens the American way of life. They only want their share and the share of their people. It's not love of people that is going to end racism in this country, nor will it be violence or legislation. It might be enlightened self-interest because our nation, our technocratic republic, has room for many more producers and consumers. Malcolm X was killed by people who were quite intelligent, and who were fully indoctrinated into our Machiavellian ethical scheme. When Carmichael and Brown are killed it will result from ignorance and fear. (By the way, I wonder what Malcolm would have said about Elijah Muhammed's acolyte, Muhammed Ali?)

Nonetheless we listen to both Carmichael and Brown in masochistic self-flagellation as they tell us that "we" share the blame with "liberal" America for the plight of the black people of this country. Then we receive our indulgence by going off, telling ourselves that we are to be liberals no more. We accept the absurd contention that racism is the heart of this country's troubles. Would someone please tell me who was the genius who, after a thorough analysis of American society, decided that racism was either a causal factor or a solution? That's lousy Marxism; it's an even worse interpretation of Weber. Oh yes, I forgot: they are outdated. Perhaps. But I see a lot of people side-stepping them. I'm still waiting for someone to refute the questions they raised. Perhaps Debray's tactics are better fitted to our time, but tactics do not make for social analysis.

One last point: this idea of community guilt that we have built upon the model of Germany under Nazism. If you wish to feel guilty for the sins of this society, I suppose you have the right to judge yourself. Perhaps we are all equally guilty; perhaps this is a democracy. Perhaps. However, let's get off the backs of the German people. We once again missed the point when we accused and convicted them of "crimes against humanity." The charges should have read "crimes of civilization." We didn't declare war to stop the massacre of European Jewry. There is such a thing as shared guilt, but it's shared by all mankind. And lest we forget, we already have our expiation, not to mention grace, forgiveness, and oh yes, love. What say we stop fooling ourselves and get on with the business at hand. We are living in a society which has replaced tragedy with absurdity. As Christians we hold the one constant that may be left to man. Our world is in need of a revolution, but let us always proceed in the same faith as Philippe Maury:

It is true that our hope for the kingdom delivers us from despair, encourages us to engage in politics without anxiety, enables us to struggle with a certain sense of humor - because our human efforts, effective or ineffective, cannot change Christ's victory. He rules the world, he uses us to manifest his lordship - yet nothing, not even our failures and betrayals, can prevent his continuing to reign from the beginning of the world to all eternity.

Amen.

VIEWPOINT

Vol 5. No. 12

April 26, 1968

LIVING ON THE LEFT HAND OF GOD

Dr. Calvin B. Marshall

MEMPHIS BLUES AGAIN

Carol Moseley

A SPOON FULL OF SUGAR

Richard Young

The sermon by the Reverend Calvin B. Marshall is printed in this issue not only at the judgment of the editorial staff, but at the request of the Student Council. It was felt that Dr. Marshall's address was an occasion of such critical importance that it should be received by the Student Body through its official representatives.

THE EDITORS

Joseph Preston

Carol Moseley

George Dosier

John Mulholland

Howard Happ

Andrew Woods

Theodore Atkinson

William LeMosy

VIEWPOINT is a bi-monthly student publication at Princeton Theological Seminary. It is an informal journal of opinion, and welcomes contributions from students and faculty. Poetry, criticism, essays, and commentary on the campus environment are all welcome, so long as each contribution expresses a reflective point of view. Articles should be submitted, typewritten and double-spaced, to the Office of Student Publications, 6 Hodge Hall, no later than the Friday preceding the date of issue in which they are to appear. The editors reserve the right not to print, or to defer for later publication, any article submitted. The editors assume no responsibility for opinions other than their own; neither do the articles herein reflect the official position of Princeton Theological Seminary.

LIVING ON THE LEFT HAND OF GOD

Rev. Calvin B. Marshall

Text: St. Matthew 25:34-45

Western civilization, American democracy, and its expression of the Christian church finds itself in the state of judgment - a judgment that is brought about by living on the left hand of God. In my youth, growing up in a very strict evangelical tradition, may were the times that I heard preachers sermonize from this text. Without exception they dealt with it from the standpoint of eschatology, but really I could care less at this point in my life about the oppressor getting his just due at some far off awesome judgment day. It is meaningless to me as the golden slippers that await the oppressed in Heaven.

I think it is more realistic and far more fitting for us to concern ourselves with the judgments of God that confront this society and the Christian church at this present moment. Indeed, all over the world, the church stands in judgment.

She has failed to do the things she should have done, and she has done those things that she should not have done. The church in America has been a still voice as racism has ravaged the society, entrenched poverty has become the plight of a major segment of the population and injustice seem to be the rule of measure. The church in her own quest for acceptance, sophistication and in her own headlong desire to participate in the carving up of the materialistic pie of this capitalistic system has decided that it would be more beneficial for her to stand quietly by.

With the exception of a few individual churchmen and possibly some small movements, it has been the norm that the church would submit and follow the mores of the society, rather than to stand in opposition to the same. Because she has chosen this path her voice is unheard, her light shineth not, and her influence is nil. She, in fact, is not the body of Christ on earth; she does not constitute a peculiar people zealous for the works of her Christ. She has become on the other hand a sounding brass and a tinkling symbol. She lives on the left hand of God. She stands in judgment.

Recently, a group of clergymen were called together in Washington, D. C. (on September 27-30, 1967) by the National Council of Churches to address themselves to the tensions in our urban centers. As we met, in the first session it became clear to us that black and white churchmen could not deal with each other honestly because of the fact that so much of our relationships in the past had been built upon our mutual hypocrisy. It thus became necessary for us to break up into individual caucuses of the conference which became known as the Black and White Caucuses of the Conference of Urban Tensions, National Council of Churches.

Let me quote from the paper that came out of the black caucus:

We, black churchmen, meeting in caucus find ourselves profoundly distressed, disturbed, frustrated and in a state of utter disquietude about the nature and mission of the church in a time of revolution. We have come to realize that Black Power is an expression of the need for Black Authenticity in a white dominated society, a society which has from its earliest beginnings displayed unadulterated racism. We affirm without fear of repudiation the meaningfulness of blackness and our identity as Black Churchmen. We confess the guilt which is ours

for past actions and inaction in failing to be instruments for the expression of the will of God as Black Churchmen. We therefore propose now to speak and act, even to our own shame and guilt, the lack of the church's responsiveness to the needs of black people seeking to be free and to become human beings in a dehumanizing society. We call upon the white churches at this point in history to recognize that in spite of the many commendable contributions in the past to the struggle for social justice, we have come to a point when the very structures, forms and priorities are being seriously questioned, particularly by the Black Power Revolution. Racial justice can no longer be considered just another cause pursued by a few while the rest of the church does business as usual. Moreover, it cannot simply be a cause alongside of other causes - to be used as a ploy to justify the existence of the church, but must become the number one priority as it is the number one problem of the nation.

Certainly, it should be apparent to you from this statement that as black churchmen we did not excuse ourselves from the judgments of God. We, too, found ourselves for many years living on the left hand of God. The black church, which was primarily founded in this country to interpret the gospel of freedom to black people sold our people out for the same mess of pottage and for the acquisition of mammon.

In this period of self-examination, we also found that our major city churches and most of our suburban churches and even a few of our rural churches no longer want to minister to the needs of the poor and the impoverished, but that we have become very middle-class oriented. This was seen across a wide spectrum from the kinds of people that we saw as members to the restructuring of our worship and liturgy so that it would correspond more closely to white churches. We became ashamed of our music; we became ashamed of our spirited expressionism and we sought the cool, so-called dignified procedures of our white brethren in worship. We lost sight of the fact that our music, which was born in our churches, is the only music indigenous to the American scene, and as we lost sight of these symbolic things, we also lost sight of the plight of the masses of black people.

We were caught in this trap because everything in our society that was supposed to be good, noble, lofty and right was white, but thank God the stones of the Black Revolution were raised up and as angry, militant black people took to the streets articulating their grievances and pledging to fight to their death for freedom, a significant amount of black churchmen began to perceive the role and the unique purpose for the black church in this society. And the movement started to move from the left hand of God to his right hand. For we became aware that living on the left hand of God was, in fact, not living at all but simply existing in the physical condition and being sick unto death spiritually.

In this same conference the following declaration came from the white caucus:

1. The problems of race in American are centered in white America.
2. The white church is a racist church.
3. The American black man did not create the ghettos, the ghettos of our sick cities. White American has enslaved him.
4. The American black by and large does not own the ghetto. They are owned by white men.
5. The American black does not control the ghettos. They are controlled by immoral structures of white men.
6. However, American blacks will transform the ghettos despite many seeking ways not to transform the ghettos or we will consti-

tute an apartheid society. The body gathered in this caucus is determined to transform white society. We are encouraged by the courage of the black American brethren who have shown us that they will create a new black society in America. Therefore, where it is possible we will move together for the transformance of American society. Where it is not possible at present, we will work separate, knowing at the same time that our separate work with blacks and whites is our common task and work together.

This statement was without a doubt a difficult one for this group to arrive at. It took a good deal of self-searching and honesty on the part of those who were involved in this caucus to come forth with these kinds of accusations against themselves.

We do not doubt the sincerity of those who took part in the caucus that produced this statement but we must clearly state that statements are not enough and that concrete actions must come about on the part of the white church establishment in this society if she is to move from the left hand of God to his right. We wish that we were able to say that this would be an easy task, but we know that the very nature of the Christian gospel and the very nature of Christian confrontations come about in the context of the cross and crises.

The white church is now faced with the fact that if she is to move away from the influence of the white power structures of this nation that she must suffer. She must suffer for her past involvements. She must suffer for ignoring the dehumanizing conditions in which so many people live in this country. She must suffer for her missionary and paternalistic attitudes. She must suffer for her past worship of the American political, economic and social system. She must suffer because her God is, in fact, pink-skinned and her primary allegiance was always to pink skin and her commitment to the gospel was only spoken and very rarely done.

This is the only path by which the ecclesia of God can become evident in American society. We call upon white churchmen to become the peculiar people of God. We call upon her to escape from the safe enclaves of her institutionalism within this society. We call upon her to become a militant, marching, confronting, revolutionary force for great is the upheaval in our society and the resolution of man's plight in this society will not be solved by political means or by war, but it can be solved if the church becomes again a living functioning force.

Most of you gathered here this morning are preparing for vocations in the church. You will ultimately have to make the choice as you enter into your vocation of committing yourselves to do business as usual or of committing yourselves to change. Business as usual will be a relatively safe thing. Change will be a dangerous thing. Business as usual will reap a sense of peacefulness and will doubtlessly bring about a measure of financial security. Commitment to change and revolution on the other hand will thrust you into crisis situations and, indeed, you might find yourself in a materially deprived condition. This is the option, but is it really an option. Does the church, the churchmen and future churchmen have a choice any longer? Can we safely set out to live on the left hand of God?

It is my opinion that we no longer have this choice. It is my feeling that the church is living in the eleventh hour of its history. It is my feeling that either she elects to become the church of her master or prepare for her demise. The movements of history will no longer allow her to exist with her lofty ideals and her gutter expressions. She is on the spot!

The hungry of the world cry out for meat, the thirsty of the world cry for water, the black stranger in a land that he has helped to build with his sweat and his blood wants in; the naked of the Mississippi delta want to be clothed; the sick and the rat bitten of the Harlem ghettos want treatment. The black youth who has been made a prisoner by inferior education, by the lack of jobs and opportunities, by his consignment and confinement to the dark ghettos wants to be released from prison. They are trying to find that church on the right hand of God who will feed, who will quench thirst, who will cloth, who will heal and who will release them from their shackles.

The black militants are saying that there is no church on the right hand of God. Many within and many without this nation who have opposing theological and political ideologies are saying that there is no church on the right hand of God. Some are even saying that God is dead. Others are saying that he is not dead, but he is a prisoner in the church, which lives on his left hand.

I say to you this morning that He lives. I say to you this morning that small movements of men are beginning to move to His right hand, but I also despair because of the minute nature of these movements and I appeal to you as you shall go forth from this place to enter into the Christian ministry that you will settle yourselves on the right hand of God, that you work, suffer and even die there, if necessary, for to live on the right hand of God is the essence of living - to live on his left is the sickness unto death.

MEMPHIS BLUES AGAIN

Carol Moseley

The day itself disturbs, anticipates
 With warm gray wind that will not rain;
 To prod expected freedom of spring break
 I rise at seven, out early Hebrew class--
 To understand an exodus,
 the bondage, bitter plagues, my hardened heart
 demands a truer Sitz im Leben.
 Today my hands need work and laundry makes
 Fine slavery since it serves for self alone.
 Walk through warm wind to lunch,
 Note each new daffodil, how sharp against
 The atmosphere which enervates, insists,
 still secretive, and threatening storm.
 To bank, withdraw resources for weekend,
 Return to room; all concentration cancelled now
 Flip idly through old magazines,
 Play bitter, lonely songs--"If I
 Should wake you in the night
 And ask you who I am, O take me to
 the slaughterhouse and leave me with the lambs."
 To dinner, same wind, same flowers, still
 it will not clear, refuses rain.
 Light talk, of maypole, lanterns, picnic on the quad.
 Wind rises, seminar gathers slowly:
 "He won't be here, they had their baby,
 .. Yes, a girl--Are you going home
 Next week--Don't know yet, well, maybe--
 I got a card from Tom from Rome,
 It shows a waving, tiny Pope--

One grad turned in his card last night--
I see some signs of hope
If we work fast and hard and fight
For there's so little time."
Sorry to be late, but on my way I heard--
O God, oh no, no, yes, "critical" in Memphis,
But how? they have the gun; damn bastards, God!

Our education for freedom is always becoming
An education for death. "Practice dying,"
Our dialectic model said; oh who
will structure change like this?
"Vital education" means lessons smashed
Into our guts and we are sick and numbed
And go on planning, for so little time
is left. The smell of rain blows through
The drifting smoke. O sometimes it causes me
to tremble, tremble, and sometimes I feel like,
O go all the way down, Moses; I'm stuck up here
in Princeton with those Memphis blues again.

A sound of wind. The dark and heavy drops
Assault the open window.

--April 4, 1968--

A SPOON FULL OF SUGAR
Richard Young

What's it all about,
This cause I seek to tout?
Well, it's obvious that this is no time for verse. As much as I
dislike committing my message to prose, where an author's faulty
logic is so concretely revealed and where vagueness is no virtue,
I want to make my plea perfectly clear. Having been a part of
both "This is the Word" and verily/ MERRILY has opened my eyes:
church drama is here to stay, and if Princeton Theological
Seminary wants to rise to the occasion and get a piece of the
action, we students and faculty who are concerned had better
take action this spring---NOW!

As many of you know, a group of us, directed by Bob Jacks,
presented the liturgical drama "This is the Word" during several
worship services this Spring. We started our career in Miller
Chapel during the first part of December, traveled to Pennington,
N.J., New York, Pottstown, Pa., and closed with Chicago on March
8. The New York and Chicago services were for area meetings of
United Presbyterian Men, involving several thousand men each.
As a result of the exposure provided by these appearances our
liturgical drama group received more invitations than we could
accept. We could not satisfy the demand mostly because of the
troupe's conflict with field education positions.

One fact became very apparent, though: the churches' felt need for a traveling drama group able to provide special programs both in a context of worship and of entertainment. Here is an excellent opportunity to complement the ministry and public relations spread abroad by our PTS Touring Choir.

Knowing all the time and trauma involved in preparing and presenting a dramatic production, you may well ask, "Why should I bother with a drama group; what's in it for me?" I can answer you only on the basis of my own experience, but on that alone I can confidently reply, "PLENTY!" Let me tell you about a few of the benefits I've felt from being involved for just four months.

Theological awareness: About the nature of the Church and the Ministry verily/ Merily taught me more than I can articulate. Time and again I find a line or a sing that pops up when I'm struggling to tag some current frustration of mine with the parish or with my vocation. "This is the Word" was a religious experience for me; it gave me a new confidence in the truth of the biblical account through my being able to participate in the biblical symbols rather than getting hung up on matters of grammar, vocabulary of the problem of historicity.

Sensitivity: Working on both productions gave me a greater sense of myself and of others. I learned to realize what my hands, feet, head, chest, eyes and the pitch of my voice were saying as a whole. I also felt the joy of using my newly discovered abilities in joining with others to create something that spoke. Those with whom I worked and slaved slowly became real to me; no longer were they merely stimuli for a "Hi" nor neighboring shadows in a lecture hall, but partners with me in trying to make a worship experience or an ecclesiastical comment. What their bodies and voices were saying became more perceptual to me along with my own deeper self-sensitivity. We were in touch with ourselves, one another, and God in a way more deeply than ever before.

Community: Face it, this seminary is not a community. As I have already intimated, through sharing a common task, I have found a fellowship in both productions far beyond fair-weather friendship; it's as though we've become one huge family. The bonds that we have developed through struggling together, to do a good job in a performance, through carrying one another's burdens (literally, on the Chicago trip)--these have supported me in more peripheral crises than I care to mention. When I've been low and blue, individuals of the "family" have expressed their concern and tried to cheer me up. As one of the girls put it,

"It's so good to know someone cares." That tender, loving care has been the spoonful of sugar which helped me swallow much bitter medicine this semester.

Money: Last but not least, there is enough money to be made doing liturgical and church drama to make it worth while. The fees a seminary touring drama group can command won't make you rich, but they rival the returns of field-education-for-income's-sake.

There's no good reason why Princeton Theological Seminary shouldn't be put on the map as being "where it's at" regarding religious drama. We have four professional actors and a published song-writer-play-wright on the speech faculty, plus the support of a competent technical staff. The abundance of students with acting interest and ability became apparent during the three productions performed this year. Of those who have already been involved and those who would like to be involved in a drama group, there must be a significant number who don't HAVE to do field education next year. The churches want what such a group has to offer.

So why not be a part of such an exciting scene? I know I would. I wish I could but I'm already a senior. All I can do is to share with you what I consider a really great opportunity. I don't know what you will do when you put down this article, but I hope that it has made enough sense to start a stampede up the Stuart Hall stairs straight to the Speech Studios. Start a Movement!!! Corner Mr. Jacks, Dr. Beeners or Mrs. Damon and insist that the Princeton Seminary Touring Theater Group become an organized reality. Then stamp your feet, hollar, bawl and throw a regular FIT until they promise you that you can join the group. And I wish you a spoon full of sugar.

Dr. Calvin B. Marshall is pastor of the Park Street Zion Church of Peekskill, New York.

Carol Moseley, a member of the VIEWPOINT staff, is a Middler B.D. student. She is a graduate of Stanford University.

Richard Young, a senior B.D. candidate, is a graduate of Whitworth College, and is from Yakima, Washington.

